The Forum

JANUARY, 1895.

ARE OUR MORAL STANDARDS SHIFTING?

SOCIAL philosophers and social reformers do not always realize that what people think they ought to do is, in the long run, more important than what they really do. The religious persecutors, with all their monstrous attempts to punish inward opinions by outward pains, at least foresaw the effect of letting new standards of right and wrong come into the world. What is done in America to-day is, therefore, not the measure of the people's uprightness: the mass of crime and folly which the morning paper brings to our unwilling notice may mean only that the reporter dwells on what seems most shocking. On the other hand all the current reprobation by laws, editorials, and sermons may not prove that public gambling is contrary to the accepted principles of morality, in the face of the open existence of bucket-shops and gambling houses. There is one, and only one, practical national moral standard: the conviction of the average person as to what is right and wrong. That conviction may be God-given at our birth; it may be implanted by our mothers, by our churches, or by our schools; it may be beaten in by a policeman's "billy"; but the actual American morality of the Nation is simply the "average man's" stock of convictions.

In many directions the average man has raised his own standard during the last hundred years, and is still raising it. To have abolished political privileges; to have accepted religious toleration; to have made drunkenness disgraceful; to have learned to treat the pauper, the lunatic, and the prisoner with humanity; to have destroyed slavery,—these are his splendid achievements. The country has accepted such new principles as right, and stands by them.

Copyright, 1894, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Churches begin to realize that they must appeal to this average intelligence and sense of right, and therefore ministers dwell lightly on the acceptance of doctrine and on religious observances, and strongly on good works; they look less to proof-texts for the edification of their hearers, and more to the truth. While in the ordinary private affairs of life moral standards are on the whole advancing, the old standards no longer apply to the political and social matters which now absorb so much attention; for the foundation of the Nation's judgments is undergoing a change. Yet politics and government and labor questions and public order are as dependent as religion upon the average idea of what is praiseworthy and what is iniquitous; they are all moral questions.

One of the evidences of a moral shifting is that so many people suppose that private and public affairs have two standards: that it is wrong to use an employer's time for private gain, but right for a public officer to draw his salary and then leave the regular duties to a deputy; that it is wrong to secure a privilege for one's self by bribing a city council, but right to subscribe money to a campaign fund to buy votes for a party's advantage; or that a distinction may be made between the private and public character of public men. Americans seem rather more prone than formerly to consort with Thomas, Richard and Henry, if thereby they get aid or amusement. The leading idea of a book which is said recently to have sold a hundred thousand copies in the United States seems to be that, if you can contribute to the entertainment of people, they are to receive you and make you a friend, no matter what your character. The scoundrel Svengali is courted by three respectable Englishmen, and allowed to acquire a fatal influence over their *protégée*, because he can play a folding flageolet. Think of the Svengalis in American politics, perfectly well known to be consorts and partners of thieves and unjust persons, and yet accepted in political and even personal fellowship by honest men!

In matters of government all good Americans know themselves to be like the Neolithic Man:

> "We are going to live in cities and build churches and make laws;
> We are going to eat three times a day without the natural cause;
> We are going to turn life upside down about a thing called gold;
> We're going to want the earth and take as much as we can hold."

Wherever a thousand of us are set down together—in a California mining-camp, or a Dakota prairie, or a Sandwich Island,—we know

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how to form an orderly community with open discussion, parliamentary practice according to Jefferson's Manual, and legislation by a majority vote,—of white people. Free government depends upon the acceptance of this wholesome dictum of majority rule; to refuse to abide by it is an evidence of moral obliquity. There are many evidences of the decline of the old-fashioned, good-tempered agreement to come to a decision and take the consequences if one is outvoted. For instance, filibustering, the commonest engine of the minority, is essentially immoral, because it denies the right to reach a conclusion. It is also a very common practice for minorities of a city council or legislature, or of the House of Representatives, to hold off and refuse to permit the organization of their body; the practice seems to strike the public mind as an amusing trick, instead of a betrayal of popular government, and practical anarchy. "If the minority will not yield, the majority must, or there is an end of government."

Another very interesting and significant change of public standard is seen in the growing impatience with legal and constitutional methods of bringing about a change of laws. There is hardly a State constitution which may not be amended within two years, or a city charter which may not be altered within a year, or a law which cannot immediately be repealed if the community demand it. The experience of New York City in saving Central Park from the speedway shows how the worst legislatures cower before a plain indication of the people's will. Yet Americans grow more and more impatient. We know so well the power of organization in politics, and the difficulty of getting legislation when opposed by powerful interests, that we all wink at breaches of the law; that is, the unpopular statute is practically abrogated by ignoring it. From this condition of befogged morals springs such an episode as the recent impudent request of nearly fifty of the leading business men of Denver that the enforcement of the laws against gambling be suspended. If Colorado likes gambling, let it repeal its laws, and invite Eastern people to come and live in such a paradise; but to retain the law and then to suspend it is a case of what the philosophers call "both being and not being."

"The horseleech hath two daughters, crying, Give, give." Americans appear to grow more disposed to illustrate the proverb by living on the Government. Of course the whole theory of rotation in appointive and non-political offices is that the party in power has a right to pay for the private services of its followers out of the public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treasury. A recent Governor of the State of New York put this practice in its baldest form when he approved a corrupt public contract so as to pay off his election expenses. The ordinary state of mind as to pensions is similarly low. A few months ago a distinguished soldier, diplomat, and statesman defended the action of a man who was drawing a pension for total disability while an active member of the United States Senate. "The law," said he, "makes no distinction; it does not recognize the possibility of mental labor by a man physically disabled." "But," it was objected, "might not the Senator look at the matter simply as an honest man?" "You might as well say that I have no right to the pension that I draw," replied the General. The discussion ceased at that point; but the wonder remained that men of wealth and station and public spirit should take, and encourage others to take, payment for their own gallantry. There is no effective public sentiment even against notorious pension frauds. In what community would a person be esteemed who gave information against a widow who had married again and still drew her pension? Yet any of us would notify the police if he saw the same woman stealing ribbon at a counter.

This lack of moral alertness is seen likewise in the tariff question. The stanchest upholder of a tariff intended to encourage national industries, or to retain the home-market, or to raise wages, may blush at the influences by which the last two bills have been shaped. Under the McKinley tariff the free list increased nearly two hundred million dollars and tariff taxes fell off by twenty-seven million dollars. Yet it is deservedly unpopular because of the general belief that many duties were introduced at the demand of persons who had rendered service to the leaders of the party in power. That unpopularity did not prevent Senators of the other party from doing the same thing, apparently in the belief that their constituents would not be seriously disturbed. In this, as in other moral questions, the responsibility lies not in the greed of the few, but in the acquiescence of the many. To depend upon the Government to keep up the profits of one's business by successive enactments is sufficiently demoralizing; to permit extortion by our representatives is morally the same as to extort.

The relations of employer and employee in this country had for many years a unique and happy experience. In colonial times there were no workmen, in the modern sense, but handicraftsmen; their social status is indicated by the traditional term "help," for distinc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions between master and man were of little account when all worked side by side. The Colonies never knew the European systems of trades-guilds, and there was a constant incentive and opportunity to rise from employee to employer. The right of the workman, as of every other man, to go where he liked within the Union is inserted in the Federal Constitution, along with that right of free trade between States which loosed the bonds of the producer. There was every incentive to a man to labor, to improve, to move about, to save money, to "work out his own salvation with fear and trembling." So well established was this industrial freedom that the country easily adjusted itself to the change of commercial conditions brought about by the development of manufactures and transportation on a large scale. Until about six years ago the whole system seemed founded on the following simple and well-understood principles, acknowledged by masters, men, and the public as natural and right, as a sort of unwritten code of labor law: The relation of employer and employee is one of mutual advantage; the business supports them both, and the usual feeling is one of good will. Workmen may freely organize unions for any lawful purpose that seems good to them; and they have a right to remain outside such unions if they please. In case of differences a strike is a reasonable method of enforcing the workman's opinion, provided there be no violence. A man is free to follow any trade for which he thinks himself fitted, and to leave service and to seek other service at his discretion. On the other side, the master has a moral right to increase or diminish his force or to close his works according to his judgment of the business: but not to discharge a faithful man from mere personal dislike. A man out of work is temporarily unfortunate, but will soon find something to do; a man who will not work for a fair wage when work is provided is a tramp and needs nobody's sympathy. On the question of wages, there must be an agreement: masters ought to pay what the business can afford; men must try to keep him up to paying a just rate. The whole relation is not one of contract or duress; it is a mutual agreement terminable at immediate notice by either party.

In the above statement there is no attempt to state or to discuss the economic principles of capital and labor; but simply to set forth what the public seemed to think about it, say as late as 1888. Already at that time the ground was prepared for a great change. Industry was rolling into larger masses. Consolidations, leases, combinations and trusts made masters fewer, and brought the men into

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal relations with hired managers, instead of proprietors. Trades-unions began in like manner to aggregate into powerful national organizations. Then came the great Southwestern railroad strike, the first of the general strikes. Ever since, it has been evident that a new spirit is abroad. What is the present state of the average mind as to the right and wrong in the relations of capital and labor?

The writer was for the year from August, 1893, to September, 1894, at a distance from the country, and caught only faint rumors of what was going on at home, except for the explosion in Chicago, of which the echoes penetrated everywhere. On his return he was amazed to find how different was the tone of public sentiment. So far as can be gathered from the unconscious indications of the newspapers, and from the utterances of many intelligent men who are neither employers nor employed, the following is a fair statement of the present average opinion: Industry is warfare, in which labor and capital are each trying to tear away spoils from the other. The right to strike includes the right, by all means short of violence, to prevent non-strikers from taking the places of strikers; the unemployed member of a labor union deserves public aid; the non-member of a union who accepts a place vacated by a striker is a "scab," and does not deserve protection, though public order is a good thing too. Employers are necessarily hostile to their laborers, and withhold all that they possibly can of wages or of consideration. In case violence occurs in a strike the responsibility lies with the employer for not yielding to the strikers; but a particular striker who kills or burns does very wrong. It is the duty of the State to see that workmen have "a living wage," to interpose in labor troubles, and to compel the employers to accept arbitration; but it is hardly just to compel workmen to accept the arbitration, if it go against them. Maintenance of the peace by force of arms is a brutal and dubious expedient. In any case of trouble between a corporation and its workmen the presumption is that the corporation is wrong.

Is it too much to say that this statement of principles is more moderate than the actual convictions of at least one-third of the people in the Northern States of all classes and pursuits? The farmers of the Northwest hold railroads responsible for most of their ills; the large class which lives by supplying working-people with the necessaries of life naturally sympathizes with them; and thousands of conservative people of the middle class, who have little to lose or gain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from strikes, appear convinced that "labor needs protection." The notion that labor and capital are by nature antagonistic to each other is perhaps helped out by another principle which has been busily enforced by certain politicians. For two centuries and a half the importer and exporter had been looked upon as a public benefactor; and the "benevolent merchant" is the hero of Sunday-school books. Now we are passionately assured that the importer is engaged in an unpatriotic and immoral business: that there is a rightful national profit and advantage in selling goods, but none in buying them. In the same way people see the profits of the employer, and do not realize that he can make nothing except by permitting others to make something. Into the profound discontent with corporations and their management the limits of this paper do not permit inquiry: there must be reason for it, or it would not be so widespread; but it neither justifies nor explains the plain tendency to look upon "capital" as the enemy of "labor."

To the dissatisfaction with corporations is probably due the remarkable change of public sentiment toward strikes. The old-fashioned strike was a cessation of work, more or less complete, by the employees of one concern or at most of the allied workers in one town. Such movements have been a very powerful and legitimate means of keeping up wages and preventing oppressions, and even when nominally unsuccessful they have often been effectual in compelling employers to recognize the money-value of a good understanding with their men. Hence the public has endured the inconvenience, provided the methods were peaceful. Now the very word has taken another meaning. Says Professor Ely in a discussion of strikes in the October FORUM: "They are a species of warfare and must be viewed somewhat in the same light in which we look at war in general." This was not true ten years ago; it is true of many of the recent strikes; and they have been occasions for the use of force on both sides. To the public mind a "strike" has come to mean a disorderly and passionate contest between two powerful parties; and the average man has a new set of opinions upon such struggles.

In the first place the public has come to accept the long-disputed contention of the workmen, that the "master workmen," "walking delegates," or other representatives of the unions ought to be received by employers as the responsible persons with whom they are to deal in case of disagreements. Since the unions almost always include

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men from several or many establishments, this system means, of course, that negotiations are to be carried on with persons whom the employer has, perhaps, never before seen. It is useless to struggle and object: the *agora* of public opinion, which is the highest tribunal in the United States, has decided that the old personal relation of the "boss" with his "hands" must give way to a system of diplomacy between ambassadors of the employers and delegates of the employed. Yet here arises a question of serious import and growing difficulty. What is to be the status of those who refuse to join the unions? The old notion was distinctly that they were to be unmolested, and it is not plain yet that the average man expects them to join or else be excluded from employment. Probably people do not realize the importance of a change by which public sentiment no longer protects the man who prefers to work in his own way by personal agreement with his own employer. The obligation to join a trades-union, whether enforced by boycott, by brickbats, or by exclusion from the privileges of arbitration and protection which are given to unions, is an obligation which is directly contrary to the most ancient principles of American government. It is a revival of mediæval guilds, and restrictions on labor; it is the formation of an *imperium in imperio*. It is a deadening process, tending to ignore the natural differences of capacity and strength between men. It is a part of that pressure toward uniformity which is the most dangerous symptom of American democracy. There is but one society to which men must belong, whether or no; and that is the State.

The same influence is at work at the other end of the industrial system, only there the small manufacturers and tradesmen protest against it, while the workmen seem to welcome it. Why should not the same rule be applied to both parties? Combination and organization are practically established by both corporations and workmen; may they not be legalized, while securing to all those who prefer to stand out the fullest protection against any discriminations? Many small concerns may still flourish if allowed equal transportation facilities: many thousands of workmen may be prosperous in their own way, if protected from boycotts.

Everybody knows the reply of the English barrister to the judge who interrupted him with: "But that's not the law, you know."—"It was the law, your Lordship, till your Lordship spoke." A few days ago it would have been safe to say that whatever might be the desire of the Nation as to arbitration in labor disputes, no system

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could be accepted the results of which were not equally binding on both sides. The Report of the Commissioners on the Chicago strike necessitates new public sentiment and a new moral law. "It is the duty of the Government to have them [the railroads] accept the decision of its tribunal, even though complete reciprocal obligations cannot be imposed upon labor." The doctrine itself is not new; it has repeatedly been put forth by ardent advocates of State interference: but its acceptance by disinterested and able men is a thunderbolt. A court with powers to require railroads to pay specified wages and to retain specified employees is in itself a reversal of old-fashioned ideas as to the contract nature of service. A recommendation that the workmen be neither bound to accept the wages thus fixed nor to remain in service, even for a day, nor to observe in any way the convenience of the travelling public in the time or manner of their strike, may possibly be American morals, but it certainly is not the morals of even two years ago.

Perhaps the most significant change of the public conscience is with regard to violent acts of all sorts, and especially violence accompanying strikes. Murderers were once treated as beasts; then as dangerous men; and now more or less as heroes. It is hardly fair to make the average man responsible for the shameful celebrity given to criminals; but there certainly is a bluntness of the public conscience as to the moral duty of keeping order. "No army of mercenaries deserves popular support," says a highly educated literary man, in discussing the use of troops in Chicago; and he adds, "If these trusts and corporations that make a business of lobbying know that an army stands at their beck and call, an army that asks no questions, that simply shoots straight when the word is given, the task of doing equal and exact justice will be impossible." This is sufficient evidence of a dangerous tendency to look upon corporations and millionaires as the only people who have anything to be defended by military force. Jefferson said as long ago as 1787: "I hold that a little rebellion now and then is a good thing, as necessary in the political world as storms in the physical. . . . Let the people take arms, pardon, and pacify them. . . . The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants." In 1808 he wrote about the opposition to the Embargo in New England: "I think it so important an example to crush these audacious proceedings and to make the opposers feel the consequences of individuals daring to oppose a law by force." Even he was compelled to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeal to the *ultima ratio regum* when he had the responsibility of preserving the Union; for he saw at last that armed disobedience is disorganization.

In a case like the Chicago strike the question is not whether force shall be used,—that was settled by those who attacked the railroad shops and trains,—but whether unlawful and uncontrolled force shall yield to force directed by law. The chief evil of mobs is not that they destroy property and life, but that they encourage lawlessness: a mob is simply a momentary military organization, acting without a constitution; it is a despotism of the worst, because of the most irresponsible, kind. Despotisms sometimes have good objects in view; but they are force, and have to be met and repelled by force whenever they attack established governments. To admit that there may be orderly mobs or justifiable mobs is to admit that the time has come for a political revolution. "Many impartial observers," says the Report on the Chicago Strike, "are reaching the view that much of the real responsibility of these disorders rests with the people themselves and with the Government for not adequately controlling monopolies and corporations, and for failing to reasonably protect the rights of labor and redress its wrongs." This statement is in effect the assertion that labor, after an honest effort, has been unable to secure adequate laws, and therefore that a breach of the law is morally justifiable. If it be correct, the machinery of popular government has broken down, and the experience of mankind shows that in such a case the workingman loses most. The reign of law, the *régime* of ballots instead of bullets, is the triumph of the organized many over the powerful few: to teach the nation that there is any better way of reaching its ends than by discussion and legislation is to give up, and to go back to the "law of might" of the Middle Ages. Has the moral standard of the American people so far drifted from its moorings?

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HUMILIATING REPORT OF THE STRIKE COMMISSION.

It is probably safe to say that in no civilized country in this century, not actually in the throes of war or open insurrection, has society been so disorganized as it was in the United States during the first half of 1894; never was human life held so cheap; never did the constituted authorities appear so incompetent to enforce respect for the law. The social fabric seemed to be measurably near to dissolution, and the country was not far from the verge of anarchy.

During the coal strikes whole counties lay terrorized at the mercy of armed mobs who committed incendiarism and murder where they pleased and with impunity. The vagabond forces of Coxeyism swept across the country levying compulsory alms on peaceful communities, stealing trains, taking forceful possession of the operation of railway lines, openly defying the laws and the military power of the United States. In Colorado, the officers of the State, where they did not sympathize with, were totally powerless to reduce to submission, the miners who were intrenched in frank and undisguised insurrection and daily perpetrating crimes of violence against life and property—crimes of which the story has not yet been told and probably never will be told in all its brutality and horror. In the strike on the Great Northern Railway, by which 4,000 miles of line were temporarily paralyzed and vast stretches of country were left without communication with the outside world, deeds of lawlessness were done of which the perpetrators could not be convicted because the sympathy of communities was with them and against the enforcement of the law.

The spirit of social and industrial unrest seemed to culminate in the great railway strikes of June and July, which, originating in Chicago, spread southward as far as the Gulf of Mexico, eastward almost half-way to the Atlantic seaboard, and westward to the Pacific coast. The original pretext for the strikes was, according to the leaders, a controversy, involving chiefly a question of wages, between Pullman's Palace Car Company and certain of the employees in its shops. This pretext, however, was thrown aside in the very earliest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stages of the trouble, which rapidly developed, first into a general warfare (or boycott) of railway employees of almost all classes against such railway companies as operated Pullman cars; secondly, and almost immediately, into a still wider conflict between the various classes of railway employees and practically all the railway companies of the West; and, finally, into a condition of widespread disorder in which, for the space of more than two weeks, the operation of some 70,000 miles of railway lines, on which were employed about 300,000 men, was either wholly or partially suspended; property of the value of millions of dollars was wantonly destroyed; many lives were sacrificed; armed mobs held possession of railway tracks and yards; trains bearing passengers, including women and children, were deliberately wrecked,—not for purposes of robbery but simply as a measure of retaliation against the railway companies and against society; the laws of the United States and the injunctions of Federal courts were set at defiance; the forces of individual States were powerless to preserve order, and in no less than eight States the military power of the General Government had to be used to move interstate commerce and the United States mails.

In its last stage the uprising was not confined to the employees of railways. For some days it was uncertain whether the cause of revolt would not be taken up by all classes of organized labor throughout the country. Leaders of organizations, not at all connected with railways, did not hesitate to threaten that if the Government interfered to enforce the laws, such interference would be the signal for a general rebellion. When the crucial moment came, wiser counsel happily prevailed. Some isolated classes of workmen, entirely disconnected from the railway service, did throw themselves hot-headedly into the fray, believing that others would follow; but the general industrial revolution by force of arms was temporarily averted.

During the period of suspense the situation was more critical and more menacing than anything which has been seen in the United States since the close of the Civil War. It is not surprising that the events of those days should have awakened in many quarters grave misgivings as to the stability of our form of government, and serious doubts as to the adequacy to our present political conditions of that instrument on which our Government is founded, and which sets forth in its preamble that one of the objects for which it is framed is to "insure domestic tranquillity."

There have been strikes before, involving vast interests and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bitterly contested, but none fraught with such sinister significance as those of last July. What caused the most profound alarm in all thinking minds was not any individual incident of the uprising, so much as the fact that the spirit of discontent and of despair should have so far saturated large masses of the people of our country as to make such things possible,—not anything which was done, so much as the method of its doing and the narrow escape from what was undone.

Whence comes this discontent? What are its causes and how has it attained such growth? How are we to check it? These questions every man was asking, and on the finding of a satisfactory answer to them seemed to depend (and still depends, for the temporary quiet is no assurance of permanent security), not the prosperity only, but the very existence of our institutions.

When, therefore, on July 26, the President, exercising the authority conferred upon him by the act of 1888, announced the appointment of a Board of three Commissioners to make investigation into the causes and conditions of the recent disturbances, his action was generally applauded. It is rarely that a temporary commission has such important duties laid upon it as were laid upon Carroll D. Wright, John D. Kernan, and Nicholas E. Worthington. And in proportion as their responsibility was great, so was their opportunity. The country had suddenly found itself face to face with the most serious danger that had threatened it for a quarter of a century. The events of the preceding months had developed not merely a local bitterness or a temporary irritation on the part of a certain number of employees against their individual employers, but a deep-rooted and widespread hostility on the part of great masses of our population against the whole scheme of constituted society. To the Commissioners was entrusted the task of unravelling the threads of this tangled skein of hostility and bitterness, and of laying them in orderly wise before the President and the people, showing which strand should be picked up here and which one severed there, until all might be knit together again into a harmonious fabric of peace and amity. To them was given the opportunity to render a service, not to the country only, but to humanity,—a service in the rendering of which they would have written their own names large on the history of the social evolution of the world. It was a splendid chance; and they were left untrammelled in their choice of means to improve it.

To those who watched the course of the Commission's investigation, it became evident from the outset that the three members of the Board

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had no recognition of what it was that was given into their hands. But, even after it was seen that the best could not be hoped for, their report was still awaited with anxiety. Though they failed to grasp the magnitude of the charge that was laid upon them, they might yet, it was hoped, do good service; for an accurate and faithful setting forth of the facts within the narrower field to which they confined themselves would still be of no small economic value.

In such a setting forth of facts, two qualities above all others would be essential: absolute truthfulness or accuracy of statement, and entire freedom from prejudice or partiality. That these should be the two qualities which are most conspicuously lacking from the report which we have received is not only a public calamity but partakes of the nature of a national humiliation.

Through the daily and weekly press of the country, attention has already been called to a number of minor errors of fact in the report, —errors many of them of individual insignificance and assuming importance only collectively as evidence of the astonishing carelessness of detail with which the document was compiled. Other misstatements there are, however, which are of a graver nature. It is not possible within the limits of a single article to canvass in detail all the errors which the Commission has made. It must suffice rather to take one or two of the more radical misstatements.

The Commission says (on page 36): "Throughout the strike, the strife was simply over handling Pullman cars, the men being ready to do their duty otherwise." From a document which was placed in evidence before the Commission, let us pick out in outline the course of events during the eight or ten crucial days as they bore upon the operation of the Wabash Railroad. Abstracting from the document in question we find:

June 29—At 7 P.M. the switchmen at Chicago stopped work without notice.

June 30—In the forenoon the switchmen at St. Louis did likewise.

July 1—The engineers and firemen between Chicago and St. Louis went out. The freight conductors and freight brakemen at Decatur did likewise.

July 2—No freight was moved on either the St. Louis or Detroit division. Engines at various points were stoned. No trains in or out of Decatur.

July 3—All switching engineers at East St. Louis went out.

July 4—Trouble experienced at Springfield, Ill., and Ashley, Ind. The company had plenty of men willing to work, but had no protection. The company tried to take some new men to Ashley, but the strikers ran them out of town.

July 5—Some gangs of section men struck. Strikers set fire to a caboose at Litchfield at 2 A.M., and shortly after that a car-repairer's oil-house was burned, and shortly after that the freight-house was set on fire.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

July 6—Trains coming into Chicago were attacked by a mob at Thirty-fifth Street, and nearly all windows in cab, coaches and parlor car were broken. No one hurt so far as known.

July 7—A mob went to the company's tracks at Halsted Street, Chicago, and proceeded to run cars from side tracks to main track and turn them over. They turned over ten or twelve and also piled on the track timber, ties, and any other material they could get hold of as obstructions, and tore out a few rails. At other points trains were generally moving under protection of the militia.

And so on. These records apply only to the lines of the Wabash Railroad between St. Louis and Chicago and Detroit. They were in evidence before the Commission. It was also in evidence before the Commission that *no Pullman cars are handled on these lines.*

A similar record of desertion and obstruction and violence was placed in evidence in relation to the Michigan Central Railroad, on which no Pullman cars are hauled; also in relation to the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Railroad, on which no Pullman cars are hauled; also in relation to the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway, which (while it does happen to have in operation four Pullman cars recently inherited among the assets of the absorbed Milwaukee and Northern road) is on notoriously unfriendly terms with the Pullman company.

It might have suggested itself to the intelligence of the members of the Commission that, if the desire of the American Railway Union had been only to coerce the Pullman company, the first action that it would have taken would have been to discriminate sharply between the patrons of that company and those who were opposed to it—while thwarting and obstructing to the best of its ability all such companies as handled Pullman cars, to have done all in its power to assist and facilitate the operations of these companies which were already the Pullman company's enemies, or competitors. But that was not the object of the leaders of the strike. The hauling of Pullman cars and the interests of the Pullman employees were matters of indifference to the leaders of the American Railway Union.

Perhaps the most picturesque incident of the strike occurred when the contractors who had in charge the removal of dead carcasses from the stock-yards at Chicago appealed to the mayor of the city for assistance in hauling a train, loaded with rotting bodies, away from the yards to the station where they were to be disposed of. The mayor, it will be remembered, instead of furnishing police force sufficient to move that train in spite of the strikers, made request of the President of the American Railway Union for an order to the strikers to permit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its removal. The President of the American Railway Union issued the order "in the interest of public health," and the train was moved.

Does the Commission suppose that these carcasses were hauled in Pullman cars? If "the strife was simply over the handling of Pullman cars" why was there ever any trouble at the stock-yards? The handling of Pullman cars had no more to do with the attack of the American Railway Union upon the railways than had the muddying of the stream in Æsop's fable to do with the lamb being eaten by the wolf. And the wolf, also, it will be remembered, said that that was what "the strife" was all about.

Again, on page 28, the Commissioners say, "Until the railroads set the example, a general union of railroad employees was never attempted." It is difficult to believe that the United States Commissioner of Labor can be entirely ignorant of the history of railway labor organizations during the last twenty years. Yet the United States Commissioner of Labor was chairman of the Commission which made this report, and anything more flatly perversive of the facts of that history than the above statement can hardly be conceived. The "general union of railroad employees" has been attempted again and again. Attempts to achieve it—whether by consolidation or federation of existing orders or by the creation of a new order to absorb all others—have never ceased. Since the organization of the order of the Knights of Labor there has never been a railway strike of any magnitude in which a union more or less general (and always extending far beyond the limits of one class of labor or the employees of a single road) has not been in some measure achieved.

The statement quoted is part of the attack made by the Commissioners upon the General Managers' Association of Chicago. It is curiously characteristic of the purblind view which the Commissioners take of all the circumstances of the strike, that they insist on treating it as if it had been a controversy between the American Railway Union on the one hand and the General Managers' Association on the other. They ignore the fact that about twenty thousand miles of railway line (employing, at a guess, one hundred thousand men) were involved, which were owned by companies not members of the General Managers' Association, which could not under the rules of the organization be members owing to their geographical position. Except the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé Railway, no transcontinental line is represented in the Association. To limit the inquiry into the conditions of the quarrel on the part of the railroads to an examination

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the share borne by the General Managers' Association is absurd. Apart from the falsity of the statement that the organization of that association "set the example" for, or antedated, the attempt to make a general union of railway employees, the sage misgivings to which the Commissioners give vent as to the legality of the association are as irrelevant to an elucidation of the essential principles underlying the strike as they are ridiculous in law.

After the American Railway Union had declared its gratuitous warfare upon the railway interests, the representatives of the lines centring in Chicago which were members of the General Managers' Association met in response to a call for an "emergency meeting." At that meeting it was decided to make use of the machinery of the Association to withstand the attack made upon the railways, and the various lines; members of the Association then pledged themselves "to resist the boycott in the interest of our existing contracts and for the benefit of the travelling public, and to act unitedly to that end." Thenceforward the American Railway Union had, so far as the lines centring in Chicago were concerned, to reckon with the Association. The Association did not either then or thereafter represent such lines as the Southern, Union and Northern Pacific, which had to make the best fight that they could single-handed. To pretend that the strike was a measure of retaliation against the Association is not only preposterous, but is immediately seen to be false on the face of the facts —facts which were in evidence before the Commission. It might be added that had the lines in Chicago failed to "act unitedly" as they did, the destruction of life and property and the danger to society would have been incalculably worse than they were. Next to the President of the United States and the military which did duty in Chicago, it is to the General Managers' Association that the gratitude of the American people is chiefly due.

The mandate to the Commission extended to the examining into the "causes" and "conditions" of the disturbances, and to the suggestion of the best means for their adjustment. No statement could well be more misrepresentative of the causes of the strike than the phrase of the Commission which would represent the employees as uniting in protest against the union of the railways; no statement could well be framed to more completely distort the conditions of the strike than that wherein the Commission declares that the strife was simply over handling Pullman cars, the men being ready to do their duty otherwise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

During those terrible days of June and July, 1894, there was one supreme issue, and one only, at stake. Above and beyond all particular controversies as to wages and as to the relations of individual employees to individual employers—above and beyond all party sympathies or economic prejudices, the one great question was of the ability of this Government to suppress insurrection. On the one side was the party of lawlessness, of murder, of incendiarism, and of defiance of authority. On the other side was the party of loyalty to the United States. For all the treason, the violence, and rebellion, the Commissioners have no word of condemnation—the strife was simply over the handling of Pullman cars! There is not one word of praise for those who in the time of peril upheld the dignity of the nation and the sanctity of the law; but there is abundant vituperation of the "rank injustice" of corporations and the "unlawful and dangerous combinations" of the "monopolies" against the "rights of labor." The Commission sneers at all that is good in the institutions of Pullman—at the library, at the system of medical attendance, at the "sanitary and æsthetic features" of the town. It scourges the General Managers' Association and questions the competence of the Federal Courts to take the action which they took for the restraint of lawlessness. But for the leaders who prompted to insurrection and sheltered violence there is no word of reprobation, but only apology and extenuation, as of a parent pleading for the venial peccadilloes of a petted child. There is no chapter in the report of the Commission which is not an incentive to discontent and an excuse of violence. It says:

> "Such dignified, manly, and conservative conduct in the midst of excitement and threatened starvation is worthy of the highest type of American citizenship, and with like prudence in all other directions will result in due time in the lawful and orderly redress of labor wrongs. To deny this is to forswear patriotism and to declare this Government and its people a failure."

What was this "dignified, manly, and conservative conduct?" It was the conduct of the strikers at Pullman—their conduct in failing for several weeks so far to overstep the restraints of law as to demand the intervention of the military. That they took part in rioting and violence later, is forgotten. That because "until July 3" they refrained from such extremity of lawlessness as to compel their suppression by military force—for this their conduct is "worthy of the highest type of American citizenship." Verily, if American citizenship knows no loftier ideal than this, the time for despairing of the Republic has almost come.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For the ill-digested mass of matter which the Commission has lumped together at the end of its report as its "recommendations" for the "best means of adjustment" of such controversies in future, the best that can be said of it is that all that the Commission says has been said many times and better in countless magazine articles and in the daily press. That any recommendations should be based on so gross a misunderstanding of the conditions in regard to which they recommend, is almost an impertinence. For the main suggestion which they make (one already familiar enough to the public mind) for the establishment of a permanent Strike Commission, it is a measure against which there has heretofore been no such serious argument to be advanced as is now furnished by the example which this temporary Commission has set.

If the achievements of men are to be measured by their opportunities, then is the performance of the Commissioners a thing almost beyond pity. They had it in their power to give us a document which should be of service to the world and to mankind, which might have marked an epoch in the world-wide struggle for the alleviation of social discontents. In place of it they have given us a document which is untrustworthy in its statements of fact, ignorant and uncomprehending in its scope, and in its spirit cowardly with the cowardice of the politician who sets the applause of the worst element in the population above the aims of patriotism. That such a production should be in danger of taking its place among our public documents is a humiliation to the people of the United States.

HARRY PERRY ROBINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GRAVE DANGER IN OUR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION-SYSTEM.

FOR more than a hundred years our Federal Constitution has been in full operation; and yet ninety years have elapsed since the proposal and adoption of any amendment to that instrument except those three which abolished human slavery and closed the Civil War. Not a single State of the Union shows such stagnation in constitutional reform. On the contrary, our increasing States, each in its own jurisdiction, have modelled and remodelled their fundamental institutions, to check legislative and other abuses and yield more closely to popular control; yet the antiquated machinery of the Federal Government still creaks on in its operations unchanged, exposing us repeatedly to the dangers of national anarchy and confusion.

I speak of constitutional machinery alone; for as concerns the general scheme of our government and the general distribution of State and Federal powers, I offer no criticism. Our fathers framed wisely in those latter respects, and custom and precedent have aided the development of good results. A national policy may well be an elastic policy, leaving much for contingencies to shape. It is not to the fundamental system, then, of our American Union, but to the mode of bringing rulers and representatives into power, that I would ask the reader's attention. The recent proposition to choose Senators by the people of a State is well worth considering; so, too, are some of those checks upon legislative action now so common in our modern State constitutions, such as might, for instance, prevent a mere casual majority in the two branches of Congress from annexing foreign territory or admitting new States capriciously without reference to popular approval or sanction. I confine myself here to desirable reforms in the method of Presidential elections, and in the relation of both Presidential and Congressional terms to the popular elections of a biennial November.

In the first place, our anomalous method of choosing the Chief Executive by electoral colleges has become, in the course of a century, not only a senseless but dilatory and dangerous duplication. We

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

know how utterly the expedient of 1787, for obstructing popular suffrage on a national scale, has failed of its original purpose; and how truly, in consequence, the quadrennial assemblage of our present age, when millions of voters undertake on an autumn day to choose by their own ballots a President and Vice-President of the United States, has become in spirit a complete perversion of what the Constitution itself intended. Yet the letter of that instrument remains; and the people of each State still choose, after all, simply Presidential electors, just as the several legislatures chose them formerly, and as South Carolina's chose them continually down to the Civil War. So far as Federal fundamental law is concerned, a State legislature may still at any time take the direct choice of Presidential electors to itself, depriving the State voters of such suffrage; and more than this, Presidential electors, whether popularly chosen or not, have only a moral obligation to cast their votes afterward, in the college, for the candidates previously designated. The whole sanction, in short, upon which popular expression rests in the selection, every four years, of President and Vice-President of the United States—the whole assurance of legal title to a valid succession—is each individual elector's own pledge of honor to vote in the college as he was chosen to vote in November.

The original provisions of our Constitution, indeed, were soon found so faulty with respect to Presidential elections in other particulars, that after the famous tie vote in 1800, between Jefferson and Burr, when President and Vice-President were not named apart, those provisions had to be amended. But two prime evils of the original plan still confront us, showing how utterly unsuited are those provisions to the present republican age: (1) Colleges of electors still elect the Executive; and consequently the choice of a Chief Magistrate is not legally made in early November, but about a month later; and in addition to the injurious delay, the voter who casts his ballot for electors at the polls is exposed not only to peculiar misconceptions concerning his own functions, but to the far more insidious danger that corrupt and crafty politicians may yet, at some later crisis, when voting runs close, baffle the wishes of the people. (2) Nor does a plurality of votes, even in the electoral colleges, finally elect the President; for the Constitution still adheres to the eighteenth-century rule requiring a complete majority, in default of which the eventual choice devolves upon the Legislature, or rather upon one branch of it. To this latter solecism, common enough in State politics a hun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dred years ago, but long since repudiated upon bitter State experience, public attention has not been drawn as it should be. All American experience is to the practical conclusion that, desirable though a majority choice must always be, it is much better to let the candidate who has a popular plurality on the first trial at the polls come in over all competitors, than to vote over again, or to refer the ultimate selection of a Chief Magistrate elsewhere.

Nor is it to an incoming Congress, but to a retiring one, and often in effect to a defeated and dishonored one,—and in fact, to a House of Representatives, voting by States, which was constituted two years earlier,—that our Federal plan confides this momentous choice of a President whenever no candidate has received an electoral majority. What State would trust any assembly for so solemn an arbitrament short of that Legislature which was chosen at the time when the Executive was voted for? Our national perils in this respect have been less only because the national choice was more seldom; but with each new election the results at stake become more tremendous and the temptation to trifle with public opinion more pronounced. Whenever, as happened in 1892 and may happen again, some third party is strong enough to carry a State or two, or political issues have temporarily faded out, and the choice lies chiefly as among individuals, "bargain and corruption" may once more be the cry over an election by the House, as it was in 1825, and with far more substantial reason. Two years ago, during the last Presidential canvass, and while the chances appeared close in October, two distinct conspiracies, for forestalling final results and controlling the succession in case the choice should devolve upon a House already Democratic, were divulged by the press to augment the popular uneasiness. One was for the friends of the third candidate to keep the eventual election for the colleges to decide in December, by causing their own Presidential electors to invite bids for Populist principles from the two highest candidates, and then turn the scales as between them. The other plan was from another quarter, to resist all choice by the House as then constituted, upon the claim that its representation had not been based upon the new census of 1890, and ought, therefore, to be changed. From such dangers, which might otherwise have become positive ones, a sweeping majority of electoral votes for Mr. Cleveland delivered us.

Still another constitutional change is highly desirable in the same connection, and, I might add, for all our biennial elections to Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gress, in order to give symmetry to our national system of government and to adapt it to this modern age. We should abridge the present long interval which elapses between the popular vote and the entrance of a new Administration and a new Congress upon their several responsibilities. Considering that a new Presidency lasts but four years and the term of a new Congress but half that time, our present waste of national energy is very great, and needlessly so. We have profited much in the advance of popular suffrage by leaving tests and qualifications in all national voting to State discretion. We have gained in national concentration by compelling a uniform day to be observed throughout the Union for choosing the Presidential electors. But another change still more desirable (could only a constitutional amendment be had) would be to bring a newly elected Administration more speedily into power, and a newly chosen House of Representatives and Congress besides.

Ever since 1804, "the fourth of March," originally an accidental date, has been graven into the very tablet of our Federal Constitution. That day of the month and year, with its variable weather, is hardly suitable in the Potomac latitude for out-of-door pageants and parades, as we well know. In fact, inauguration-weather at Washington on the two latest occasions was as unfit as possible for the military procession and the ceremonials at the east front of the capitol. But what then? Some have seriously proposed, in propitiation of the weather, that the Constitution be so amended as to inaugurate each new Executive toward the close of spring. But this would be reform in the wrong direcion. Mere ceremonials, anywhere or at any time, are liable to capricious weather, and may readily conform to circumstances. The paramount interest, however, of the people of this Union is to have their declared will carried expeditiously into effect; and from that preferable point of view, whatever Constitutional amendment substitutes some other date for the fourth of March will require America's inauguration day to be moved backward and not forward.

Constitutional reforms are, indeed, difficult to carry; but this is, more than anything else, because the people are not aroused to considering them. Where the change proposed is not likely to excite party opposition, nor to inflame State or sectional jealousy, it is worthy, at least, of consideration and effort. State constitutions have borne much salutary improvement; and we ought not to persuade ourselves that constructive inspiration in whatever pertains to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

welfare and stability of the whole Union perished with the Revolutionary fathers. Let us set ourselves, then, to repairing the weak joints of this constitutional armor, where almost all else is strong. The present basis for an electoral proportion by States has its merits and need not be exchanged for a numerical poll of the whole Union; but, in either case, we should sweep out, once and for all, this dangerous and superfluous electoral college, and set each State to devoting the month which follows the November vote to its own official registry of State results. We should abolish the present intervention of a House of Representatives, or reduce it to the remote contingency of a tie between the candidates, trusting, as in State elections, to the rule that a popular plurality shall elect, once and for all. The House of Representatives, and the Congress, to revise results and formally announce the choice, should be the incoming and newly chosen, and not the outgoing, one; and all concerting opportunity for mischief between a Congress and an Administration already delegated to retirement—all such opportunity as embarrassed and paralyzed the country so greatly in 1860 if not in 1876—should be reduced to a minimum. With a month gained by the abolition of electoral colleges, it would not be difficult for a newly chosen Congress to enter upon its functions at New Year's; and for the new Executive in alternate Congresses to be installed then or soon after, following the common example of the States. An adjournment of Congress, long enough to give a new President time to make up his Administration and formulate a policy, might perhaps be provided; but the United States is scarcely a representative government at all, if public agents elected to meet existing conditions must invariably begin their work under later ones, at the same time that they are liable to stand long in the way after they have been superseded.

JAMES SCHOULER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS THE EXISTING INCOME TAX UNCONSTITUTIONAL?

In the discussions that have followed the re-enactment by Congress of an income tax, the proposition has been frequently advanced, and supported by lengthened argument and citations, that the tax in question is unconstitutional, and therefore illegal,—because it is a direct tax, and not in conformity, as respects assessment and levy, with the clause in the Constitution of the United States (Article 1, Section 2) which requires that "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers"; and in the ninth section of this same article, the above provision is in effect reaffirmed in the following terms: "No capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census, or enumeration, hereinbefore directed to be taken."

If now the existing income tax is a direct tax, and has not been laid and apportioned as the Constitution clearly requires, then clearly it is unconstitutional and illegal, and all provisions for its imposition and collection are void. But is the income tax a direct tax? The United States Supreme Court had this question fairly and squarely before it for consideration in 1880,[1] and held that under the definition of a direct tax as expressed in the Constitution, an income tax was *not direct* but *indirect*, and, accordingly, that its imposition and collection were not unconstitutional. The exact language of the court was as follows: "Our conclusions are that *direct taxes*, within the meaning of the Constitution, are only capitation" (poll) "taxes, as expressed in that instrument, and taxes on real estate; and that the tax of which the plaintiff in error complains" (*i.e.*, an income tax) "is within the category of an excise or duty." This decision, it may here be remarked, was in opposition to the opinion of every economic or financial writer or authority from Adam Smith down; and inferentially also to the opinion of Alexander Hamilton,[2] who

[1] Springer *v.* United States, 12 Otto, 102 U. S. Reports, S. C., p. 586.

[2] See Hamilton's brief in the carriage case of Hylton *v.* United States, 1794; Hamilton's Works, Vol. VII., p. 848.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

helped to frame the Constitution. In all the debates in the British Parliament also, it is doubtful if any British statesman can be named who has ever spoken of an income tax as other than a direct tax. But be this as it may, the opinion of the Court, as above cited, is the law of the land, or determination of what the law means; and, until it is reversed, there can be no more interest or profit in discussing the constitutionality of the income tax from the predicate that it is a direct tax, than attaches to the time-honored schoolhouse debate as to whether rum or war have been productive of the greater evil.

But there is another point or basis, on which the constitutionality of the existing income tax may possibly be impugned with success, which does not seem to have hitherto attracted public attention, and which is worthy of consideration.

To appreciate and understand the involved issue, it is essential to obtain in the first instance a clear view of the incidence of an income tax. Upon what does such a tax fall? One American writer of repute on economic subjects assumes "*faculty*," or the native or acquired power of production, to be an equitable basis for taxation; and his answer might be that it falls on "faculty." But "faculty" is not an entity, and a tax to be productive must be assessed on something that is material or an entity. A little reflection must satisfy us that an income tax is always a tax on property, for in default of any property there will be no income or basis for taxation; wages, salaries, interest, rents, gains, or profits in business, as elements of income, being simply terms characterizing the different manifestations or forms of property.[1]

It may also be regarded as an economic axiom that when a government taxes the income of property, it in reality taxes the property itself. In England and on the Continent of Europe land is taxed on its yearly revenue, or income value, and these taxes are always considered as land taxes. Alexander Hamilton in discussing the taxation of incomes derived from property goes even further, and in asking the question, "What is property but a fiction without the beneficial use of it?" leads to the inference that property, and the income derived from it, are substantially one and the same thing.[2]

[1] "Income for services is money (property) in the form of wages, commissions, brokerage, etc."—Hillard, Law of Taxation.

[2] The following court decisions are also pertinent to this question: "All must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With this brief exposition of the true and sole objective of an income tax, attention is next asked to the eighth section of the first article of the Federal Constitution, which reads as follows:

"The congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; *but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.*"[1]

We have, therefore, a clear and imperative constitutional mandate as to the manner in which the Federal Government must assess an income tax in common with all other duties and excises; and the question of next importance that presents itself is, Do the provisions for assessing the present income tax conform to such mandate? And the answer turns on the definition, or interpretation, of the term "uniform" in its application to taxation.

The framing of such a definition has not been free from difficulty, and has often come up before the court for determination. The late Mr. Justice Miller, in his Lectures on the Constitution, discusses it at some length, and states his conclusions as follows:

"A tax is uniform within the meaning of the Constitutional requirement, if it is made to bear the same percentage over all the United States,"—and again, "When they" (the statutes) "use the words 'taxes must be uniform,' they mean uniform with regard to the subject of the tax; . . . that is, different articles may be taxed at different amounts, provided that the rate is uniform on the same class everywhere, with all people and at all times."

To complete this argument, it only remains to consider what is meant by property of the same class. The answer to this is, obviously, property which immediately or directly competes in open

perceive that a tax on the sale of an article imported only for sale is a tax on the article itself."—Chief Justice Marshall, 12 Wheaton, 439.

In the case of Weston *v.* City of Charleston, the U. S. Supreme Court decided that when a State was prohibited from laying a tax on United States stock it could not evade the prohibition by laying the tax on the income of the same and of other stocks.

"A devise of the income of land is in effect the same as a devise of the land itself."—9 Mass., 372; 1 Ashmead, 136. "A devise of the rents and profits of land or the income of land is equivalent to a devise of the land itself."—Washburn on Real Property, 2, 752.

In the case of Dobbins agt. the Commissioners of Erie county, the court decided that the emoluments of an office could not be taxed if the office was exempt.—16 Peters, 435.

[1] If the omission of the word "taxes" in the last part of this section may seem to limit the application of the injunction of uniformity, the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Springer case above noticed, that an income tax "is within the category of an excise or duty," certainly divests such omission of any application to this form of taxation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

market. The force of competition is not dependent upon the quantity owned or produced by few or many persons, but upon the aggregate quantity of similar property offered in market, whether produced or owned by few or many persons. On the ground of eminent judicial authority and common sense, territorial uniformity by taxation must therefore imply and involve absolute uniformity and equality of taxation on like values and quantities.

If an income tax is laid at the same rate or percentage upon all incomes, there would be no question as to its uniformity and compliance with the constitutional provisions. On the other hand, if such a tax is laid as the present income-tax law proposes, with discriminating incidence or with different rates or percentages on different incomes, there would seem to be no ground for assuming that it was invested with uniformity, or was in compliance with the constitutional mandate. Let us suppose, for illustration, three farms designated as A, B, and C, owned by three persons, producing the same products, or the same class of products—wheat, corn, potatoes, and the like—and returning a profit or income to their respective owners from the sale of these products under the same competitive conditions. Let us suppose further that the profit or income from the farms A and B is in each case $4,000; while the profit or income from farm C, owing to a greater area of land cultivated, or greater energy and skill on the part of the owner, is $8,000. Under the present discriminating income tax the profits or income of the two farms, A and B, and of two persons, under an exemption of $4,000, would be free from all income taxation; while the profit of the competitive farm C, producing the same income as the other two farms, would be subject to a tax burden, on half its income or profit, of two per cent, if, as assumed, the farm happens to be in the hands of a single owner. The aggregate of the value or income of the property is the same in both cases, but the incidence of taxation is made dependent upon the circumstance of making the assessment upon two persons rather than one. This is not equality of burden on competing property, or on immediate competitors, but may be fairly characterized as robbery.

Under the operation of natural laws, larger quantities will be owned and produced in one State than in another. Colorado and Texas have large herds of cattle, Illinois has large cornfields and large distilleries, Louisiana large sugar plantations, and New England large factories, owned by single persons. Two States may, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in some instances do, have nearly equal *per capita* wealth in the aggregate; but in the one the wealth may be made up of capital invested in numerous small industries adapted to soil and climate, while in the other, owing to different natural conditions, there may be great concentration of capital in a few hands and in few industries.

Thus, in the case of the income tax enacted during the war period, seven States in the year 1869—Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and California—possessed forty per cent of the assessed property of the United States, and had just about forty per cent of the population. But at the same time these same seven States paid fully three-fourths of the entire income tax levied by the Federal Government upon the people of the whole country; or, to put it differently, the States which had sixty per cent of the wealth and population of the country paid only about one-fourth of the income tax.

There is another clause of the Federal Constitution which is pertinent to this subject, namely, Article V., which provides that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation. It must be conceded that this is a limitation on the power of Congress. There must be a line between the taking of private property for public use and taxation; but how can that line be drawn except by the rule that taxation means uniformity of burden on competing avocations and competing property? A decision of the Supreme Court of New Jersey some years since seems to have a direct bearing upon the unconstitutionality of discriminating burdens, on the same class of persons or property. Thus the New Jersey Court said:

> "A tax upon the person or property of A, B, and C individually, whether designated by name or any other way, which is in excess of an equal apportionment among the persons or property of the class of persons or kind of property subject to the taxation, is, to the extent of such excess, the taking of private property for a public use without compensation. The process is one of confiscation and not of taxation" (36 N. J., p. 66, 1872).

A word in conclusion on the subject of exemptions, which all modern systems of income taxation have recognized to the extent of discriminating in favor of persons in receipt of comparatively small incomes, and which, being effective in producing discrimination and inequality in taxation, may be regarded as constitutionally illegal: An exemption is freedom from a burden or service to which others are liable; but an exemption for a public purpose or a valid consideration is not an exemption except in name, for the valid and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

full consideration, or the public purpose promoted, is received in lieu of the tax. Nor is an exemption from taxation a discriminating burden on those who pay an income tax, provided the person or institution benefitèd by the exemption is a pauper, or a public charitable institution; for then there is consideration for the exemption, and it is justified as a matter of economy, and to prevent an expensive circuity of action in levying the tax with the sole purpose of giving it back to the intended beneficiary of the Government. The avoidance of this unnecessary circuity of action is not, moreover, an injury but a gain to those who pay the tax. It cannot, however, be seriously claimed that a man having $100,000 of productive capital, and receiving from it $4,000 of annual income, is entitled to receive support from the Government as a public pauper.

The United States Supreme Court, in the case of Loan Association *v.* Topeka, held that our Government, State or National, cannot impose taxes for the purpose of fostering any *private* business or enterprise. Taxes can be imposed only for public purposes; and, when they are imposed for any other purpose, the Government acts the part of a highwayman and takes forcibly the property of A and gives it to B. In short, there is the same reason why all exemptions of like property from taxation should be based solely on the ground of a public purpose, as that all taxes collected should be for a public purpose.

Finally, the principle involved in this question of discriminating income taxation is one that affects the foundation and continued existence of every free government, namely, the equality of all men before the law. Any exemption whatever, under an income tax, be it small or great, except to the absolutely indigent, is purely arbitrary; and the principle once allowed may be carried to any extent. Any exemption of any portion of the same class of property or incomes is an act of charity which every patriotic American citizen ought to reject upon principle and with scorn, except under circumstances of great want and destitution. Equality and manhood, therefore, demand and require uniformity of burden in whatever is the subject of taxation.

DAVID A. WELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DICKENS'S PLACE IN LITERATURE.[1]

It is a fearsome thing to venture to say anything now about Charles Dickens, whom we have all loved, enjoyed, and laughed over: whose tales are household words in every home where the English tongue is heard, whose characters are our own school-friends, the sentiment of our youthful memories, our boon-companions and our early attachments. To view him in any critical light is a task as risky as it would be to discuss the permanent value of some fashionable amusement, a favorite actor, a popular beverage, or a famous horse. Millions and millions of old and young love Charles Dickens, know his personages by heart, play at games with his incidents and names, and from the bottom of their souls believe that there never was such fun, and that there never will be conceived again such inimitable beings, as they find in his ever-fresh and ever-varied pages. This is by itself a very high title to honour: perhaps it is the chief jewel in the crown that rests on the head of Charles Dickens. I am myself one of these devotees, of these lovers, of these slaves of his: or at least I can remember that I have been. To have stirred this pure and natural humanity, this force of sympathy, in such countless millions is a great triumph. Men and women to-day do not want any criticism of Charles Dickens, any talk about him at all. They enjoy him as he is: they examine one another in his books: they gossip on by the hour about his innumerable characters, his never-to-be-forgotten waggeries and fancies.

Yet here in my path stands an inexorable editor bidding me include Charles Dickens in this small series of mine on the "Victorian Writers." And how could we avoid some notice of one whose first immortal tale coincides with the accession of our Queen, and who for thirty-three successive years continued to pour out a long stream of books that still delight the English-speaking world? When we begin to talk about the permanent place in English literature of eminent writers, one of the first definite problems is presented by Charles Dickens. And it is one of the most obscure of such problems; be-

[1] Copyright also in England.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause, more than almost any writer of our age, Charles Dickens has his own accustomed nook at every fireside: he is a familiar friend, a welcome guest; we remember the glance of his eye; we have held his hand, as it were, in our own. The children brighten up as his step is heard; the chairs are drawn round the hearth, and a fresh glow is given to the room. We do not criticise one whom we love, nor do we suffer others to do so. And there is perhaps a wider sympathy with Charles Dickens as a person than with any other writer of our time. For this reason there has been hardly any serious criticism or estimate of Dickens as a great artist, apart from some peevish and sectional disparagement of his genius, which has been too much tinged with academic pedantry and the bias of aristocratic temper or political antagonism.

I am free to confess that I am in no mood to pretend making up my mind for any impartial estimate of Charles Dickens as an abiding power in English literature. The "personal equation" is in my own case somewhat too strong to leave me with a perfectly "dry light" in the matter. I will make a clean breast of it at once by saying, that I can remember reading some of the most famous of these books in their green covers, month by month, as they came out in parts, when I was myself "in my 'teens." That period included the first ten of the main works from "Pickwick" down to "David Copperfield." With "Bleak House," which I read as a student of philosophy at Oxford beginning to be familiar with Aristotelian canons, I felt my enjoyment mellowed by a somewhat more measured judgment. From that time onward Charles Dickens threw himself into a great variety of undertakings and many diverse kinds of publication. His "Hard Times," "Little Dorrit," "Our Mutual Friend," "Great Expectations," "Tale of Two Cities," were never to me anything like the wonder and delight that I found in "Oliver Twist," "Nickleby," and "Copperfield." And as to the short tales and the later pieces down to "Edwin Drood," I never find myself turning back to them; the very memory of the story is fading away; and I fail to recall the characters and names. A mature judgment will decide that the series after "David Copperfield," written when the author was thirty-eight, was not equal to the series of the thirteen years preceding. Charles Dickens will always be remembered by "Pickwick," "Oliver Twist," "Nickleby," and "Copperfield." And though these tales will long continue to delight both old and young, learned and unlearned alike, they are most to be envied who read him

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when young, and they are most to be pitied who read him with a critical spirit. May that be far from us, as we take up our "Pickwick" and talk over the autobiographic pathos of "David Copperfield."

This vivid sympathy with the man is made stronger in my own case in that, from my own boyhood till his death, I was continually seeing him, was frequently his near neighbour both in London and the seaside, knew some of his friends, and heard much about him and about his work. Though I never spoke to him, there were times when I saw him almost daily; I often heard him speak and read in public; and his favourite haunts in London and the country have been familiar to me from my boyhood. And thus, as I read again my "Pickwick," and "Nickleby," and "Copperfield," there come back to me many personal and local memories of my own. The personality of Charles Dickens was, even to his distant readers, vivid and intense; and hence it is much more so to those who have known his person. I am thus an ardent Pickwickian myself; and anything I say about our immortal Founder must be understood in a Pickwickian sense.

Charles Dickens was before all things a great humourist—doubtless the greatest of this century; for, though we may find in Scott a more truly Shakespearean humour of the highest order, the humour of Dickens is so varied, so paramount, so inexhaustible, that he stands forth in our memory as the humourist of the age. Swift, Fielding, Hogarth, Sterne, and Goldsmith, in the last century, reached at times a more enduring level of humour without caricature; but the gift has been more rarely imparted to their successors in the age of steam. Now, we shall never get an adequate definition of that imponderable term—humour—a term that was invented to be the eternal theme of budding essayists. We need not be quite as liberal in our interpretation of humour as was Thackeray in opening his "English Humourists"; for he declared that its business was to awaken and direct our love, our pity, our kindness, our scorn for imposture, our tenderness for the weak, to comment on the actions and passions of life, to be the week-day preacher—and much more to that effect. But it may serve our immediate purpose to say with Samuel Johnson that humour is "grotesque imagery": and "grotesque" is "distorted of figure: unnatural." That is to say, humour is an effort of the imagination presenting human nature with some element of distortion or disproportion which instantly kindles mirth. It must be imagina-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive; it must touch the bed-rock of human nature; it must arouse merriment and not anger or scorn. In this fine and most rare gift Charles Dickens abounded to overflowing; and this humour poured in perfect cataracts of "grotesque imagery" over every phase of life of the poor and the lower middle classes of his time, in London and a few of its suburbs and neighbouring parts.

This in itself is a great title to honour; it is his main work, his noblest title. His sphere was wide, but not at all general: it was strictly limited to the range of his own indefatigable observations. He hardly ever drew a character or painted a scene, even of the most subordinate kind, which he had not studied from the life with minute care, and whenever he did for a moment wander out of his limits, he made an egregious failure. But this task of his, to cast the sunshine of pathos and of genial mirth over the humblest, dullest, and most uninviting of our fellow-creatures, was a great social mission to which his whole genius was devoted. No waif and stray was so repulsive, no drudge was so mean, no criminal was so atrocious, but what Charles Dickens could feel for him some ray of sympathy, or extract some pathetic mirth out of his abject state. And Dickens does not look on the mean and the vile as do Balzac and Zola, that is, from without, like the detective or the surgeon. He sees things more or less from their point of view: he feels with the "Marchioness": he himself as a child was once a Smike: he cannot help liking the fun of the Artful Dodger: he has been a good friend to Barkis: he likes Traddles: he loves Joe: poor Nancy ends her vile life in heroism: and his dog worships Bill Sikes.

Here lies the secret of his power over such countless millions of readers. He not only paints a vast range of ordinary humanity and suffering or wearied humanity, but he speaks for it and lives in it himself, and throws a halo of imagination over it, and brings home to the great mass of average readers a new sense of sympathy and gaiety. This humane kinship with the vulgar and the common, this magic which strikes poetry out of the dust of the streets, and discovers traces of beauty and joy in the most monotonous of lives, is, in the true and best sense of the term, Christ-like, with a message and gospel of hope. Thackeray must have had Charles Dickens in his mind when he wrote: "The humourous writer professes to awaken and direct your love, your pity, your kindness—your scorn for untruth, pretension, imposture—your tenderness for the weak, the poor, the oppressed, the unhappy." Charles Dickens, of all writers of our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

age, assuredly did this in every work of his pen, for thirty-three years of incessant production. It is his great title to honour; and a novelist can desire no higher title than this.

There is another quality in which Charles Dickens is supreme—in purity. Here is a writer who is realistic, if ever any writer was, in the sense of having closely observed the lowest strata of city life, who has drawn the most miserable outcasts, the most abandoned men and women in the dregs of society, who has invented many dreadful scenes of passion, lust, seduction, and debauchery; and yet in forty works and more you will not find a page which a mother need withhold from her grown daughter. As Thackeray wrote of his friend,—"I am grateful for the innocent laughter and the sweet and unsullied page which the author of 'David Copperfield' gives to my children." We need not formulate any dogma or rule on such a topic, nor is it essential that all books should be written *virginibus puerisque;* but it is certain that every word of Charles Dickens was so written, even when he set himself (as he sometimes did) to describe animal natures and the vilest of their sex. Dickens is a realist in that he probes the gloomiest recesses and faces the most disheartening problems of life: he is an idealist, in that he never presents us the common or the vile with mere commonplace or repulsiveness, and without some ray of humane and genial charm to which ordinary eyes are blind. Dickens, then, was above all things a humourist, an inexhaustible humourist, to whom the humblest forms of daily life wore a certain sunny air of genial mirth; but the question remains if he was a humourist of the highest order: was he a poet, a creator of abiding imaginative types? Old Johnson's definition of humour as "grotesque imagery," and "grotesque" as meaning some distortion in figure, may not be adequate as a description of humour, but it well describes the essential feature of Charles Dickens. His infallible instrument is caricature—which strictly means an "overload," as Johnson says, "an exaggerated resemblance." Caricature is a likeness having some comical exaggeration or distortion. Now, caricature is a legitimate and potent instrument of humour, which great masters have used with consummate effect. Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo, Rembrandt, Hogarth use it; but only at times, and in a subsidiary way. Rabelais, Swift, Fielding, use this weapon not unfrequently; Shakespeare very sparingly; Goldsmith, and Scott, I think, almost never. Caricature, the essence of which is exaggeration of some selected feature, distortion of figure, disproportion of some part, is a potent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resource, but one to which the greater masters resort rarely and with much moderation.

Now with Charles Dickens, caricature—that comical exaggeration of a particular feature, distortion of some part beyond nature—is not only the essence of his humour, but it is the universal and ever-present source of his mirth. It would not be true to say that exaggeration is the sole form of humour that he uses, but there is hardly a character of his to which it is not applied, nor a scene of which it is not the pervading "motive." Some feature, some oddity, some temperament is seized, dwelt upon, played with, and turned inside out, with incessant repetition and unwearied energy. Every character, except the walking gentleman and the walking lady, the insipid lover, or the colourless friend, have some feature thrust out of proportion, magnified beyond nature. Sam Weller never speaks without his anecdote, Uriah is always "'umble," Barkis is always "willin'," Mark Tapley is always "jolly," Dombey is always solemn, and Toots is invariably idiotic. It is no doubt natural that Barnaby's Raven should always want tea, whatever happens, for the poor bird has but a limited vocabulary. But one does not see why articulate and sane persons like Captain Cuttle, Pecksniff, and Micawber should repeat the same phrases under every condition and to all persons. This, no doubt, is the essence of farce: it may be irresistibly droll as farce, but it does not rise beyond farce. And at last even the most enthusiastic Pickwickian wearies of such monotony of iteration.

Now, the keynote of caricature being the distortion of nature, it inevitably follows that humourous exaggeration is unnatural, however droll; and, where it is the main source of the drollery, the picture as a whole ceases to be within the bounds of nature. But the great masters of the human heart invariably remain true to nature: not merely true to a selected feature, but to the natural form as a whole. Falstaff, in his wildest humour, speaks and acts as such a man really might speak and act. He has no catch-phrase on which he harps, as if he were a talking-machine wound up to emit a dozen sounds. Parson Adams speaks and acts as such a being might do in nature. The comic characters of Goldsmith, Scott, or Thackeray do not outrun and defy nature, nor does their drollery depend on any special and abnormal feature, much less on any stock phrase which they use as a label. The illustrations of Cruikshank and Phiz are delightfully droll and often caricatures of a high order. But being caricatures,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they overload and exaggerate nature, and indeed are always, in one sense, impossible in nature. The grins, the grimaces, the contortions, the dwarfs, the idiots, the monstrosities of these wonderful sketches could not be found in human beings constructed on any known anatomy. And Dickens's own characters have the same element of unnatural distortion. It is possible that these familiar caricatures have even done harm to his reputation. His creations are of a higher order of art and are more distinctly spontaneous and original. But the grotesque sketches with which he almost uniformly presented his books accentuate the element of caricature on which he relied; and often add an unnatural extravagance beyond that extravagance which was the essence of his own method.

The consequence is, that everything in Dickens is "in the excess," as Aristotle would say, and not "in the mean." Whether it is Tony Weller, or "the Shepherd," or the Fat Boy, Hugh or the Raven, Toots or Traddles, Micawber or Skimpole, Gamp or Mantalini —all are overloaded in the sense that they exceed nature, and are more or less extravagant. They are wonderful and delightful caricatures, but they are impossible in fact. The similes are hyperbolic; the names are grotesque; the incidents partake of harlequinade, and the speeches of roaring farce. It is often wildly droll, but it is rather the drollery of the stage than of the book. The characters are never possible in fact, they are not, and are not meant to be, nature; they are always and everywhere comic distortions of nature. Goldsmith's Dr. Primrose tells us that he chose his wife for the same qualities for which she chose her wedding gown. That is humour, but it is also pure, literal, exact truth to nature. David Copperfield's little wife is called a lap-dog, acts like a lap-dog, and dies like a lap-dog; the lap-dog simile is so much overdone that we are glad to get rid of her, and instead of weeping with Copperfield, we feel disposed to call him a ninny.

Nothing is more wonderful in Dickens than his exuberance of animal spirits, that inexhaustible fountain of life and gaiety, in which he equals Scott and far surpasses any other modern. The intensity of the man, his electric activity, his spasmodic nervous power, quite dazzle and stun us. But this restless gaiety too often grows fatiguing, as the rollicking fun begins to pall upon us, as the jokes ring hollow, and the wit gets stale by incessant reiteration. We know how much in real life we get to hate the joker who does not know when to stop, who repeats his jests, and forces the laugh when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it does not flow freely. Something of the kind the most devoted of Dickens's readers feel when they take in too much at one time. None but the very greatest can maintain for long one incessant outpour of drollery, much less of extravagance. Aristophanes could do it; Shakespeare could do it; so could Cervantes; and so, too, Rabelais. But then, the wildest extravagance of these men is so rich, so varied, so charged with insight and thought, and, in the case of Rabelais, so resplendent with learning and suggestion, that we never feel satiety and the cruel sense that the painted mask on the stage is grinning at us, whilst the actor behind it is weary and sad. When one who is not amongst the very greatest pours forth the same inextinguishable laughter in the same key, repeating the same tricks, and multiplying kindred oddities, people of cultivation enjoy it heartily once, twice, it may be a dozen times, but at last they make way for the young bloods who can go thirty-seven times to see "Charley's Aunt."

A good deal has been said about Dickens's want of reading; and his enthusiastic biographer very fairly answers that Charles Dickens's book was the great book of life, of which he was an indefatigable student. When other men were at school and at college, he was gathering up a vast experience of the hard world, and when his brother writers were poring over big volumes in their libraries, he was pacing up and down London and its suburbs with inexhaustible energy, drinking in oddities, idiosyncrasies, and wayside incidents at every pore. It is quite true: London is a microcosm, an endless and bottomless Babylon; which, perhaps, no man has ever known so well as did Charles Dickens. This was his library: here he gathered that vast encyclopædia of human nature, which some are inclined to call "cockney," but if it be, "Cockayne" must be a very large country indeed. Still, the fact remains, that of book-learning of any kind Dickens remained, to the end of his days, perhaps more utterly innocent than any other famous English writer since Shakespeare. His biographer labours to prove that he had read Fielding and Smollett, "Don Quixote" and "Gil Blas," "The Spectator," and "Robinson Crusoe." Perhaps he had, like most men who have learned to read. But, no doubt, this utter severance from books, which we feel in his tales, will ultimately tell against their immortality.

This rigid abstinence from books, which Dickens practised on system, had another reaction that we notice in his style. Not only do we feel in reading his novels that we have no reason to assume that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he had ever read anything except a few popular romances, but we note that he can hardly be said to have a formed literary style of his own. Dickens had mannerisms, but hardly a style. In some ways, this is a good thing: much less can he be said to have a bad style. It is simply no style. He knows nothing of the crisp, modulated, balanced, and reserved mastery of phrase and sentence which marks Thackeray. Nor is it the easy simplicity of "Robinson Crusoe" and the "Vicar of Wakefield." The tale spins and the incidents rattle along with the volubility of a good story-teller who warms up as he goes, but who never stops to think of his sentences and phrases. He often gets verbose, rings the changes on a point which he sees to have caught his hearers; he plays with a fancy out of measure, and turns his jest inside out and over and over, like a fine comic actor when the house is in a roar. His language is free, perfectly clear, often redundant, sometimes grandiloquent, and usually addressed more to the pit than to the boxes. And he is a little prone to slide, even in his own proper person, into those formal courtesies and obsolete compliments which forty years ago survived amongst the superior orders of bagmen and managing clerks.

There is an old topic of discussion whether Dickens could invent an organic and powerful plot, and carry out an elaborate scheme with perfect skill. It is certain that he has never done so, and it can hardly be said that he has ever essayed it. The serial form in parts, wherein almost all his stories were cast, requiring each number of three chapters to be "assorted," like sugar-plums, with grave and gay, so as to tell just enough but not too much, made a highly wrought scheme almost impossible. It is plain that Charles Dickens had nothing of that epical gift which gave us "Tom Jones" and "Ivanhoe." Perhaps the persistent use of the serial form shows that he felt no interest in that supreme art of an immense drama duly unfolded to a prepared end. In "Pickwick" there neither was, nor could there be, any organic plot. In "Oliver Twist," in "Barnaby Rudge," in "Dombey," in "Bleak House," in the "Tale of Two Cities," there are indications of his possessing this power, and in certain parts of these tales we seem to be in the presence of a great master of epical narration. But the power is not sustained; and it must be confessed that in none of these tales is there a complete and equal scheme. In most of the other books, especially in those after "Bleak House," the plot is so artless, so *décousu*, so confused, that even practised readers of Dickens fail to keep it clear in their mind. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

serial form, where a leading character wanders about to various places, and meets a succession of quaint parties, seems to be that which suited his genius and which he himself most entirely enjoyed.

In contrast with the Pickwickian method of comic rambles in search of human "curios," Dickens introduced some darker effects and persons of a more or less sensational kind. Some of these are as powerful as anything in modern fiction; and Fagin and Bill Sykes, Smike and poor Jo, the Gordon riots and the storms at sea, may stand beside Victor Hugo for lurid power and intense realism. But it was only at times and during the first half of his career that Dickens could keep clear of melodrama and somewhat stagey blue fire. And at times his blue fire was of a very cheap kind. Rosa Dartle and Carker, Steerforth and Blandois, Quilp and Uriah Heep, have a melancholy glitter of the footlights over them. We cannot see what the villains want, except to look villainous, and we fail to make out where is the danger to the innocent victims. We find the villain of the piece frantically struggling to get some paper, or to get hold of some boy or girl. But as the scene is in London in the nineteenth century, and not in Naples in the fifteenth century, we cannot see who is in real danger, or why, or of what. And with all this, Dickens was not incapable of bathos, or tragedy suddenly exploding in farce. The end of Krook by spontaneous combustion is such a case; but a far worse case is the death of Dora, Copperfield's baby wife, along with that of the lap-dog, Jip. This is one of those unforgotten, unpardonable, egregious blunders in art, in feeling, even in decency, which must finally exclude Charles Dickens from the rank of the true immortals.

But his books will long be read for his wonderful successes, and his weaker pieces will be entirely laid aside as are the failures of so many great men, the rubbish of Fielding, of Goldsmith, of Defoe; which do nothing now to dim the glory of "Tom Jones," "The Vicar of Wakefield," and "Robinson Crusoe." The glory of Charles Dickens will always be in his "Pickwick," his first, his best, his inimitable triumph. It is true that it is a novel without a plot, without beginning, middle, or end, with much more of caricature than of character, with some extravagant tomfoolery, and plenty of vulgarity. But its originality, its irrepressible drolleries, its substantial human nature, and its intense vitality, place it quite in a class by itself. We can no more group it, or test it by any canon of criticism, than we could "Pantagruel" or "Faust." There are some works of genius

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which seem to transcend all criticism, of which the very extravagances and incoherences increase the charm. And Pickwick ought to live with Gil Blas and Tristram Shandy. In a deeper vein, the tragic scenes in "Oliver Twist" and in "Barnaby Rudge" must long hold their ground, for they can be read and re-read in youth, in manhood, in old age. The story of Dotheboys Hall, the Yarmouth memories of Copperfield, little Nell, Mrs. Gamp, Micawber, Toots, Captain Cuttle, Pecksniff, and many more will long continue to delight the youth of the English-speaking races. But few writers are remembered so keenly by certain characters, certain scenes, incidental whimsies, and so little for entire novels treated strictly as works of art. There is no reason whatever for pretending that all these scores of tales are at all to be compared with the best of them, or that the invention of some inimitable scenes and characters is enough to make a supreme and faultless artist. The young and the uncritical make too much of Charles Dickens, when they fail to distinguish between his best and his worst. Their fastidious seniors make too little of him, when they note his many shortcomings and fail to see that in certain elements of humour he has no equal and no rival. If we mean Charles Dickens to live we must fix our eye on these supreme gifts alone.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ANATOMY OF A TENEMENT STREET.

I. The Street.

Bulfinch Street is about one-eighth of a mile long, and fifteen feet wide from curbing to curbing. Brick and wooden houses are in about equal proportion. Many of the wooden houses are thirty years old—a few small ones are still older. The brick houses, which are four-storied, belong to a later period. The street is in a transition from wood to brick. Not more than a block to the right is a street whose houses are all of wood—this is Bulfinch Street as it was. Not more than a block to the left is a street whose houses are all of brick—this is Bulfinch Street as it is to be. The half of the street known as Upper Bulfinch stubbornly resists the march of progress; several of its wooden houses even have little grassless yards at one side. The brick houses of Lower Bulfinch, however, stand wall to wall in evidence of the increase in land values: eighteen-fold within the century is the record of a spot not far away. The residents of the houses with side-yards dry their clothes therein; the others must use the roofs. Three small one-and-a-half story houses are each occupied by a single large family, the rest by three to ten families each.

Tenements have from one to six rooms, most of them three. Rents of three-room tenements vary from $1.75 to $2.50 a week. One of the best of these is the second floor of No. 9 Upper Bulfinch, rent $2.50. The kitchen is a 12x15 room, lighted by a single window which overlooks a 5x8 back-yard, odorous of the garbage-barrel. It has a rough, unpainted floor; high, dark-colored mopboards; painted walls, a small sink with a water-faucet, a fair-sized dish-closet and a diminutive chimney-cupboard. Out of one end of the kitchen opens an 8x10 room with a tiny closet, and two tiny windows overlooking the back-yard. Like the kitchen this has dark woodwork, painted walls, and an unpainted floor. The third room is about the same size as the kitchen. Its two windows command the street, and it alone, of the three, gets sunlight enough to have a real cheerfulness. This cheerfulness is increased by bright wall-paper and white woodwork. The floor once had paint, but it shows few traces of it now.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two small holes in the wall serve for clothes-closets. All the rooms are low and have whitewashed ceilings. Between the front room and the kitchen is the stair-landing, lighted by a ground-glass window in the day-time, not lighted at all at night.

In this tenement live the MacGregors—father, mother, and six boys and girls. The front room is sitting-room and parlor. As the show-room of the house it has pictures and a carpet. It has to be used as a bedroom, however, by Mr. and Mrs. MacGregor and the two youngest. The vulgar disguise of the folding-bed has not yet invaded Bulfinch Street; consequently the functions of the room as a chamber rather overshadow its other functions. The rest of the MacGregors are packed away at night in the small back-room. The stair-landing, so far as the landlord allows, is used for storing slop-pails, swill-buckets, and other articles not likely to be stolen. The MacGregors have the good sense to take no lodgers. The same cannot be said of all their equally cramped neighbors. Number 9, and all the other houses of the street, are connected with the city water and sewerage systems; but none of them has gas, hot-water heaters, bath-rooms, or—trifling but portentous detail—fly-screens. One badly kept water-closet, located in the cellar, has to answer for all the families of a house. Padlocked wood-boxes and coal-bins, as many as the number of families, are also in the cellar. Many of the cheaper tenements are squalid and out of repair, and have such defective drainage that the city Board of Health would find plenty of cause for action, should it take the trouble to investigate.

Bulfinch Street is between, and at right angles to, two of the great highways of the city, which are given over to business, factories and tenements. The original dull-gray paint of the wooden houses has grown duller and grayer with age, where it has not entirely disappeared by peeling; the bricks have lost their pristine freshness; the blinds have faded from green to a color sombre and unnamable. Nevertheless, if the street has not brightness, it has scraps of picturesqueness—a dormer window to which a discouraged plant or two is clinging; a shingled, unpainted, weatherbeaten house-side bearing a dove-cot and green trailing vines; and terraces of roofs crouching about the base of a lofty church with true old-world humility.

The rough cobblestones with which Bulfinch Street is paved are rendered well-nigh harmless to the feet by the accumulations of dirt in their interstices, as well as by the miscellaneous rubbish of every conceivable description with which they are more or less thickly strewn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—rubbish which might prove the key to the cipher of scores of human lives, if the man appeared with wit enough to use it. True, a member of the Street-Cleaning Department occasionally stalks through in the wake of the garbage cart, selecting from the litter with the glance of a connoisseur such occasional pieces as seem consistent with his dignity, but such a visit makes no perceptible impression.

II. The People.

In Bulfinch Street live about 450 persons—a hundred families. Of this hundred, three-fourths are Irish, and of these three-fourths less than half are Irish-American. Seven families are from Canada, five from Scotland, and five are native American. Of the remaining eight families, two are German, two Italian, one English, one Hebrew, one French, and one Negro. In religion, eighty-one families are Roman Catholic, ten Protestant, and one Jewish; the rest claim no church whatever. Of the heads of families, more than half are common laborers. Six are carpenters, four teamsters, three storekeepers, two hostlers, two masons, two engineers. Here are also a lineman, a carriage-washer, a fireman, a lather, a roofer, a cobbler, a piano-maker, an organ-varnisher, a machinist, a sailor, a fisherman, a bridge-builder, a bartender, a cook, and an employee of the city Street Department. Highly skilled labor, it will be observed, is very scantily represented, so that the men must be very few who make a wage of $2 a day the year round.

A majority of the mothers work out as washwomen or scrubwomen. Some are dishwashers and seamstresses. One keeps store, one is a nurse, another a dressmaker, and two, at least, sell liquor. Others take in work to do at home. Very few confine themselves to their own housework. The bulk of the young men are not content to follow in their fathers' footsteps, but try to enter what they consider more genteel callings. They become, among other things, cheap clerks, bartenders, ushers or ticket-sellers at theatres, assistants in pool-rooms and managers of little cigar-stores. Now and then a Jack-at-all-trades appears. Jim O'Brien, an erratic genius of thirty, living at No. 15, has been successively grocer's boy, telegraph messenger, blacksmith, wheelwright, coachman, teamster, bartender, and saloon scullion. The girls and young women, eager as the men for genteel work, scorn all sorts of domestic labor. They are, however, eager enough to marry. Consequently, they marry young, and after a few years of child-bearing are only too glad to wash windows and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scrub floors as their mothers did. The boys nearly all sell papers, and on Sunday mornings a few black boots also. They are errand boys on Saturday, drive parcel-delivery wagons and wear the uniform of the Western Union; but these employments are looked upon as temporary expedients. The thing really desired is a place, no matter how humble, in some monster mercantile establishment. As a rule nothing but the law keeps them in school, so keen are they to earn money and become merchant princes.

The body, physiologists tell us, is renewed every seven years, so in just about that time is the population of Bulfinch Street renewed. Within limits, the people are nomadic. The Whitings have changed their residence sixteen times in eight years, and there are many more families like them. Moving from house to house in the street is perpetual. And, once a family is out of the street, it describes a sort of circle in its migrations, eventually getting back, as a rule, to the identical point it started from. In the summer, Bulfinch Street men occasionally work in the country on the farms of relatives or friends; but there is practically no emigration to the country and very little new blood comes in from the country. In the matter of worldly possessions, also, there is a very unstable equilibrium in Bulfinch Street. Fluctuation is constant between comfort and poverty. Two-thirds of the families are on the lists of one or more charitable agencies. Of these, one-third are hopelessly dependent, another third periodically so. Very few of the independent third have bank accounts of any size.

It is a favorite pastime of a certain class of charitably disposed persons to assign all the poverty in the world to a single cause, usually a sin (or what these persons consider such), frequently, too, a sin they themselves have no mind to. But in reality things are not so very simple as they would have them seem. An individual misfortune may proceed from a group of causes, and in a body of four or five hundred people so many groups of causes are at work that it is impossible to make any one cause fit even a majority of cases. The most that can safely be done is to enumerate such of the causes as have appeared with a fair degree of clearness. Low wages, of course, is often a prime cause (oftener than capitalistic philanthropists are ready to admit); though not so often, perhaps, as irregularity of employment. For the man with steady low wages at least knows what *not* to depend on, and, given a fair amount of intelligent will power, will "cut his garment according to his cloth," while the man fit-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fully employed is always on the brink of a precipice. Again, both low wages and unsteady work are sometimes due to inefficiency or unreliability of the worker, so these also must be reckoned as causes.

Death makes widows and orphans in Bulfinch Street as elsewhere. Of both, the street has more than its quota, and these almost without exception are on the charity books. Economically considered, accident and illness are—for a time—the same as death; they are causes of poverty that must be convincing. When Mr. Johnson, a carpenter living at No. 35, was paralyzed by a fall from a staging a dozen years ago there was no longer a bread-winner for Mrs. Johnson and her five children. From that single point of view Mr. Johnson might as well have been killed by the fall. That the Johnson family were paupers for ten years after was no fault of his. Three summers ago Mr. Reagan was taken to the hospital very ill of kidney trouble. Mrs. Reagan was at that time in the last stages of consumption. Josie, aged fifteen, the eldest child, had bronchitis. The family not only got badly behind with their rent, but they were obliged to sell their bedding and clothes for food. It was hardly to be wondered at.

Improvidence works sad havoc with the family exchequer, and the havoc, cruelly enough, is as great when caused by inculpable ignorance as by wanton extravagance. Wasteful cooking, buying on instalments, mortgaging furniture at exorbitant rates, and other equally disastrous practices are far too common. When John Gorman, of No. 40, died, his wife received a $400 death benefit. She indulged in the luxury of a $110 funeral, and within a year was in need.

Overproduction of children is another source of trouble. Whether the children live or whether they die, they are about equally expensive. The more desperate the family circumstances the faster the children come. And yet nature seems to smile on this form of improvidence in the long run. Children are transformed to bread-winners by time. Thus, the family dragged down at first by its surplus of children is often exalted by this very thing at the end. Comfortable old age comes quite as often to the heads of the large families as to the childless couples, since the latter have no bread-winners to call on when they themselves cease to win bread.

The multiplication of charities (which paralyze effort), old age (seldom adequately prepared for), chronic intemperance of one or both parents, laziness, desertion by the husband—all these causes of poverty are amply illustrated in Bulfinch Street. Even United States pensions have worked damage there. In the light of these few

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

facts the folly and factitiousness of the hard and fast lines drawn between worthy and unworthy by charity experts is plain enough.

III. The Life.

During its thirty years or more of comparative seclusion, Bulfinch Street has developed a life of its own that is far from being the dull, inhuman thing that popular opinion assigns to a tenement-house district; and this life resembles no one thing so much as the life of the typical New England village. Of course such a parallel must not be too much emphasized. It is valuable solely as a help to a comprehension of a manner of existence remote from the groove in which our conceptions of life naturally run. This little community of 450 people has: (1) A small bake-shop opening out of Mrs. Flanagan's kitchen and presided over by Mrs. Flanagan herself, who, like Miss Hepzibah Pyncheon, is apprized of customers by the tinkle of a little bell. (2) A cobbler's shop installed, as cobblers' shops are apt to be, in a tiny, dimly-lighted shed. The cobbler is an old, gray, spectacled, long-bearded man who is very much of a philosopher and an epigrammatist withal—the most flaring sign of his shop, "No trust, no bust," being an admirable example of his epigrammatic powers. The shop is a rendezvous for other (though inferior) philosophers and wits, and this is as it should be. (3) Three stores, two groceries in basements and one on a corner, with bread, kindling-wood, milk, and salt pickles for staple articles of traffic, but without the intellectual glory—peculiar to the country corner grocery—which is divided between the cobbler's shop and the three kitchen bar-rooms of the street.

Like the calm of a village is Bulfinch Street's atmosphere of deliberateness. Nervous prostration is unknown even by name. Joanna Murphy, a parchment-faced, swaying-gaited, thirty-years' resident, who buried her husband from this street and from it sent her children out to make their way in the world, frequently consumes half-an-hour in going from her house to the little bake-shop. On her way she chucks the little children under the chin, delighting their baby souls with grotesque, Celtic baby talk. Everybody speaks to her and she speaks to everybody. Nor is this sociable dawdling confined to Joanna. Rarely do men or women go by an occupied door-step or window without "stopping to pass the time of day." There is the same borrowing of butter, sugar, etc., from door to door as in the village; the same calling in of neighbors' children to run errands, the same use of "Miss" for "Mrs.," the same habit of loud talking, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same cautious spending of pennies by the children, the same eagerness to exhibit one's own bruises or deformities, the same eagerness to show the sick and the dead to strange visitors, the same superstitions, the same, or rather a fuller, worship of the tea-pot, the same feeling of isolation from the rest of the world, the same pride in the petty things that differentiate one family from another, the same bragging over bygone prosperity. The women of Bulfinch Street talk across the street as village women across back-yards, hold informal receptions on the door-steps, go about bareheaded or with little shawls over their heads—never with hats on, except when they are going as far away as the avenues—array themselves in the figured shawls that all country women wore a score of years ago and some wear still. They are quick to note a stranger and almost equally quick to ask him his business. They scrutinize him from the second, third, and fourth story windows, and when he is out of sight, talk him over.

But the most significant expression of the spirit of village-life in Bulfinch Street, and a truly beautiful one, is the readiness of neighbors to help each other out of trouble. Prudential motives force this exercise of brotherly love to be kept so far out of sight in streets of this kind that, as a rule, its amount is absurdly underestimated. The well-dressed visitors of charitable societies, however remote from charity their fabricated excuses for calling may seem to be, are yet known for what they are—a charity picket-line.

Eighty-year-old Bridget Mulcahy, toothless, but still bright-eyed, may be seen almost any fair day smoking her pipe on the stoop of No. 20. Her husband, Jim, a day-laborer, died eighteen years ago. For seven years before his death he was blind, and his misfortune, joined to his good-nature, made him a favorite. Soon after Jim's death Bridget dislocated a shoulder, thereby permanently losing the use of her right arm. She became destitute. The neighbors lent her many things (cooking dishes and a comforter among them) and after a little, Michael Roe, who was himself behind with his rent, gave her a home in his family. Then her friends, "the boys from Ireland," "put up" a raffle for her which netted $40. She rented a cellar room for fifty cents a week and took in two girl lodgers at ten cents a night. From that time to this she has lived in a cellar or a garret and shared her room with girl lodgers; but she has depended largely for her support upon the raffles which the "boys" have continued to "put up" for her once or twice a year. Three years ago, Michael Roe, by that time a widower, was stricken down with a fatal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sickness. Then the "boys from Ireland" got their heads together again and "put up" a benefit ball for Bridget's former benefactor. Tickets were fifty cents each and the ball netted $75. There was something left toward funeral expenses when the old man died. Then another ball was given for the benefit of his orphan children.

Raffles and balls are not the only Bulfinch Street methods of fulfilling the law of Christ. The Talbots had been in the street only a week, when their little boy died. Nevertheless, the neighbors went in with their sympathy as soon as a white rosette was tied to the door-bell. Frank Whitney, hopelessly in consumption, but possessed of a superstitious dread of going to a "home," has been taken in by Thomas Wood, who promises to keep him as long as he lives. The little help about the house that Frank can give Tom's wife is Frank's only possible return for the kindness. Neighbors send in little treats to the sick, share with each other the good things they have humbugged out of the charities, "mind" each other's children, lend their cooking-stoves, take in, for a time, evicted families, or women and children when the father is on a dangerous spree, and shelter unfortunate women during confinement.

There are a freedom and a flexibility about Bulfinch Street life that are quite unknown in the old-fashioned village. Familiar as village life is, it would scarcely tolerate a woman's combing her hair on the sidewalk, or such a race between married women, holding their dresses to their knees for greater freedom of movement, as Bulfinch Street witnessed and applauded a few weeks ago. It is significant of much, too, though a trifle in itself, that no Bulfinch Street woman would think of washing on Monday, if it chanced to be a holiday. In fact, self-sufficient as its local life appears to be, Bulfinch Street does not by any means escape the influence of the metropolis that surrounds it. The life of the great city acts constantly and strenuously upon it. Before all else stands the influence of the church. And, because Bulfinch Street Protestants are only one in ten, and many of these hopelessly irregular in church attendance, it is fair to speak of the Catholic church alone—St. Stephen's—which splendidly dominates this and scores of other streets. Upon its stalwartness the people lean, and without its ceremonial sanction few important events occur in family life. By its pomp and circumstance this little band of vulgar people is brought into a conscious relation with nearly two thousand years of glory that is past, and with the present glory of Catholic Christendom—a relation that extends to a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sense of ownership. Mysterious as the true nature of this relation and the true value of this ownership may be to them, it is none the less inspiring. These people "believe in soul." They are "very sure of God," Christ, the Virgin, the saints, the Pope. A great deal to be sure of at this end of the century!—enough, certainly, to impress their imaginations with the perpetual presence in the world of a Power, not themselves, "that makes for righteousness," enough, too, to lift them now and then out of themselves into union with that Power. Furthermore, the church, and the church only, to any considerable degree, diffuses the warm glow of ritualism over a life that otherwise would have little beauty and poetry in it.

How far the offices of the church affect the imagination is illustrated by the good Catholic mother with five children who only "counted them four" until the youngest had been christened. Bulfinch Street tradition demands at the ceremony of confirmation a new dark suit and a soldier cap for boys, and a white dress and white slippers for girls. When, after many days of anxious preparation on the part of parents and relatives, the trim procession moves along the sidewalk of the avenue or up the church aisle, each boy with a white satin ribbon on his left arm and each girl with a white gauze veil, "they show like troops of the shining ones." That day brings presents of nickels and dimes and confectionery from godfathers, godmothers and benevolent grannies. Rarely, it is easy to believe, does a boy grow into so hardened a villain as not to recall at times with a glow of true feeling the day of his confirmation; never does a mother forget the confirmation of her boy.

Extreme unction distinctly sobers, for a moment at least, the whole street. Then the priest becomes the visible messenger of Destiny. The grim, popular phrase, "anointed for death," goes up and down. The sign of the cross is made, a prayer is murmured. Relatives who are not near enough to be torn with grief take a harmless vanity in the prominence into which their family name is brought and in the assurance that all things are being done decently and in order. Weddings and funerals, though very important occasions in the life of the street, are so familiar as joyous and melancholy ceremonials that they need not be enlarged on here. The observance of Fridays and Holy Days and Lent, as well as Sundays, is another factor in making religion palpable; and the Sunday-school and the sodalities play a prominent part in the lives of the children. The very money this church relation costs enhances its value as a religious force.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The permanent value of the sort of education given by the public schools is seriously questioned in many quarters, and justly. But that the schools with all their defects materially modify the ideals of the children for the better is clear from the way in which, during the school season, they talk about their school work, and bring their out-of-school disputes to the touchstone of the teacher's dictum. The city evening schools unfortunately get very little patronage from Bulfinch Street. Nearly all its youthful ambitions are of the very near-sighted order. But the theatre is much patronized by all. In its influence upon the young it comes after the church and the school alone. The two theatres close by are the only ones much attended —another evidence of the strength of neighborhood habit. Both are low-priced and present an almost uninterrupted repertory of highly moral melodramas whose sombreness is lightened by "variety" between the acts. As these people detect neither the improbability of the plots, the fustian of the sentiments, nor the crudity of the art, the influence of the plays they hear may be adjudged, in the main, uplifting. Other outside factors of more or less importance are labor organizations, benefit and insurance orders, newspapers, prize-fights, races, ball-games, and ward politics.

Bulfinch Street family life differs in important respects from the family life of the typical village, in nothing more, perhaps, than in the parents' treatment of their children. Although the children have quite as much direct attention from the mother as in the wealthy city families which employ nurses, and, as in the village, they see quite as much of their fathers as do the children of men whose business cares exclude everything else, still the children are not properly attended to. Vicious cruelty is rare. Mothers lavish affection enough upon their babies, but they are ignorant and thoughtless and, above all, over-indulgent. If the family is eating corned-beef and cabbage and the baby cries for it, the baby gets it. So with green fruit, liquors, and other equally unsuitable things. Anything rather than have the baby cry! Drugging is occasionally practised, usually for this same reason. Tiny creatures, one and two years old, who ought to be in bed at six o'clock, are allowed to creep or toddle around till ten; and children of four or five years are sent on errands as late as eleven o'clock. Parents who have themselves never been able to save money are not likely to insist on their children's doing so. True, several of the small boys have saved money for the Fourth of July and the circus. Little Mamie Flanagan (daughter of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the proprietor of the bake-shop) has been saving for several weeks to get her pet dog licensed. Teddy Jameson is hoarding for an utterly impossible bicycle. But these are exceptions for which the parents are scantily responsible. Inconsistencies are common, of course. The very parents who take real interest and pride in their children's progress at school keep them out whenever it happens to suit their own convenience; other parents make their children lose whole terms by being too careless or bigoted to have them vaccinated.

Besides the progress of the younger generation, shown by its eschewing manual labor, are occasional signs of change in the taste or in the code of etiquette of the elder. A house that makes any pretensions at all to gentility is pretty apt to have some gaudy plush furniture and a few cheap lithographs or chromos. It is sure to have a plush album. Mrs. Kimball, of No. 1, buys bottled beer and has it delivered at the door; she has grown too high-toned "to work the growler." Mrs. Butland regularly washes off her sidewalk. Mrs. Boland and Mrs. MacGregor have peep-curtains; Mrs. O'Brien and Mrs. Conlon lace curtains, and Mrs. Jackson a $2.00 copy of Scott's "Lady of the Lake," not to mention a flamboyant subscription-book, "Ireland in Poetry and Song," and Moore's "History of Ireland." Mrs. O'Toole's Katie has a blackboard in her bedroom and Mrs. Budlong's Josie is taking lessons on the violin. Mrs. Grogan has stopped going without stockings. And while Mrs. Brannigan still smokes a pipe and Mrs. Quinn still uses her apron as a handkerchief, they are both a little ashamed; they do these things on the sly.

In amusements the children of Bulfinch Street are easily first as elsewhere. Among them are gaunt, pale, dirty, ragged, undersized, vermin-infested specimens. There is an occasional cripple, mute or half-wit. The majority have to sell papers, run errands, mind the baby, forage for wood, and do other equally tiresome things. They are perpetually liable to summons and scoldings from doors and windows, and occasionally liable to "clubbings." Their most radiant sports are shadowed by fear of the "cop," for whom they are obliged to set a watch at each end of the street. In the school season their fear of the truant-officer is still greater, inasmuch as the blessed old privilege of "playing hookey" at the risk of one or, at most, two thrashings (at school and at home) is no more. Truancy is now barbarously classed as a crime and may result in six months' imprisonment or, if obstinately adhered to, in imprisonment till the age of twenty-one. In spite of all these drawbacks the children of Bulfinch

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Street, taken as a whole, appear as buoyant and happy as other children and, in this matter at least, children are no dissemblers. They squat as readily in the middle of a street as they do on a chair or a door-step, play without stint in the dirt and yet, with a laudable catholicity of taste, take quite as keen a pleasure in fine raiment, when they happen to have it put on them, as if they were accustomed to it. The older boys hie away to a distance to play ball, fish, swim, steal rides and despoil aristocratic gutters and ash-barrels of fruit and finery. The younger boys occasionally visit a small park, about a quarter of a mile away, to give a dog a swim in the basin of a fountain or to take turns in riding a rickety wooden bicycle. The girls, too, stray away at times, impelled by milder motives.

But, in general, the sports of both boys and girls are confined to the street or its immediate vicinity. Leap-frog, hide-and-seek, marbles, peg-top, jack-stones, stick-knife, cat's-cradle, duck-on-a-rock, shinny, snap-the-whip, and blind-man's-buff are as familiar to them as to other children. They have the same pets (not perhaps in as great numbers)—dogs, cats, doves, rabbits. Some of their pastimes are as distinctly perquisites of city life, as bird-nesting, for example, is of life in the country. Such are: seeing games of the national baseball league and the sports of the big athletic clubs, stealing rides on electric cars, practising high-kicking on the fenced-in roofs, dancing the skirt dance; above all, going to the theatre.

They revel in plays of the imagination; they play house, horse, school and cars; they play white man and Indian with a few clubs, some dirty colored flannel and, for a scalp, a shred of a fur carriage-robe; they play circus with their dogs and cats; funeral with a dead rat; Salvation Army with a tin pan and a shattered, quavering old zither; Christmas tree with a dilapidated clothes-horse; and Robinson Crusoe with a tattered parasol. They get up shows and charge pins for entrance. Furthermore, they have a healthy fondness for a reasonable amount of fisticuffs. The gang known as "the Bulfinchers" thus settle a baseball dispute with the gang known as "the Greenies"; or they prevent "the Greenies" from giving a "show" in which the "Bulfinchers" are reported to be satirized. If one were to be only a child and die in early life, it were as well, perhaps, to be born in Bulfinch Street as anywhere. Such minute details of the Bulfinch Street child-life ought to be taken for granted rather than recorded. But the artificial lime-light of sensationalism has been so often thrown upon the children of the poor, they have been so long

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regarded as weaklings or monstrosities, instead of natural children, that nothing can be taken for granted.

The German and Italian poor have a commendable habit of taking many of their pleasures out by families. Not so the people of Bulfinch Street. Large numbers of family men forsake their families for the saloons and kitchen bar-rooms; a few for the theatres. The rest smoke their pipes stolidly in the windows, on the doorsteps or in the kitchen, too tired to move about, too ignorant or hampered by insufficient light to read. The men who go to the saloon are not necessarily the worse; they may be simply the more enterprising. They go, no doubt, because they are thirsty, but also because of a strong social instinct. And in at least one of the saloons frequented by them, there is considerable mental stimulus in the talk at the tables.

There are women in Bulfinch Street who work out regularly during the day and wash, iron, and sew far into the night for their own families. These are exceptions. As a class they have more leisure than the women of better-to-do streets. They ignore utterly the trifling household cares that worry the life out of the conscientious middle-class housekeeper, and they have no burdensome society obligations. They are always gossiping on the stairs. They stop for a chat at the grocery or the beer-shop. They often take possession of their doorsteps in the forenoon, and hold them until bedtime, leaving them only for meals or other more animated door-steps, sometimes pretending to sew, sometimes without even that pretence. A few women take their pleasures in the kitchen bar-rooms with the men, and some of these have brutal faces. But the faces of the majority of the Bulfinch Street men and women are neither wicked nor wretched. They express stolid, animal content.

The young men and women, more sophisticated than their elders, dress in their best and betake themselves to the avenues: the young women to attend the dancing assemblies or theatres, or to flirt up and down the avenue sidewalks; the young men to be where the young women are and to visit the saloons and pool-rooms besides. If they remain in the street after work-hours they keep on their old clothes as their parents do. The policeman on his beat is as much a god-send to the young woman as he is to the traditional park-nurse. And there is curb-stone lovemaking with the local beaux.

After the supper-hour, though with less noise, perhaps, than in the forenoon, the activity of the street reaches its height. In spite of absences on the avenues, men, women and children are all very much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in evidence. The children, especially, instead of showing weariness as by good rights they should, have, at this time, some of their wildest frolics. When it is dark, gas-lamps are lighted, one at each end of the street, and one in the middle, making just light enough to throw most of the street into shadow. The lower light is used as a loafing-place nightly by a gang of young toughs, among whom are several "students." In the phraseology of the neighborhood a "student" is a "bum" with a home, as distinguished from a common lodging-house "bum" or a tramp. The middle light projects from the most respectable and exclusive house of the street. The upper one has been preëmpted for the evening by a group of fourteen- to fifteen-year-old boys who are giving selections from the most impassioned scenes of the plays of the week. As an exhibition of memory, rather than of mimetic power, the performance is truly marvellous.

Music sounds on every side. Jack Caddigan plays a harmonica, Tom Bullard an accordeon, and Tom Wood's cornet is always to be depended on for excruciating versions of all the "home classics." Jack O'Toole's father, a veteran of the late war, has kept a genuine army trumpet all these years, upon which Jack, who aspires to be a veteran himself some day, performs a few calls with considerable skill. Pat Geoghegan, at No. 12, is rendering some real Irish songs in a sort of tuneless recitative teeming with weird Celtic melancholy. Eighteen-year-old Katie Rafferty follows him with half-a-dozen popular concert-hall melodies, delivered with the strident voice and ultra-serious air peculiar to concert-hall soloists; these are all vigorously applauded from the street. Six months ago Katie sang at an "amteur night" at the nearest of the two theatres. Since then she has affected a professional swagger.

Early quitting of work on Saturday afternoon gives the men time to rest and to change their clothes before evening. Saturday night is a lively occasion in the bar-rooms, the favorite night for avenue assemblies and for newsboys at the theatres. More people forsake the street in consequence, and from seven until eleven it is quieter there than on other nights, in spite of much passing in and out with pails of beer and Sunday provisions. After eleven o'clock, the aspect of things changes. Intoxicated merry-makers straggle in. Jim O'Grady has an attack of vomiting on the sidewalk. Young Jerry Flannagan rattles the shutters and pounds the door of the bake-shop in vain. His mother will not let him in. She is giving him a much-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

needed lesson. Mrs. Mahoney and Jim White fall to fighting in the alleyway beyond the cobbler's shop and are separated by having the contents of a slop-pail poured over them from above. Old Dolan, crazy drunk, emits such an unearthly series of yells that the people of Green and Cumston Streets, who ordinarily pay no attention to drunken yelling, come in to investigate. At No. 27 and No. 40 carousing will go on until morning, and it will be a wonder if indoors does not become so cramped before then that an adjournment will be made to the roof.

The efforts of the people of Bulfinch Street to distinguish Sunday are very noticeable. No family permanently ignores it. And if any do so, temporarily, it is an infallible sign that they are "down on their luck," or that one or both parents are on a protracted spree. Owing to the presence of the men, a fuller sociability and much indulgence in music, Sunday is more like an ordinary evening than an ordinary day; but in certain respects it differs from either. The newsboys have to rise even earlier than usual in order to get their papers folded and be at the church gates with them by 6.30,—the closing-time of early mass. All make great efforts at fixing up. The men shave, put on white shirts, polish their square-toed shoes, and conscientiously make themselves physically uncomfortable. Then, very ill at ease because of their unwonted smartness, but with a proud sense of being gentlemen—that is, wearing good clothes and having nothing to do—they sit about in their shirt-sleeves, read the papers and smoke, not the every-day pipe, but perhaps a cheap cigar.

Sunday is almost the only day on which it is possible to tell exactly how the children look, for then their faces are scrubbed and polished. A new toy is brought out for them or a new cart turned over to their use, and they are expected, except for the restraint that a consciousness of fine clothes naturally imposes, to frolic as vigorously as on week-days. The women array themselves in dresses of astounding fits and colors. Widows' weeds are, as a rule, dirty, crumpled, and rusty from overmuch wear or neglect. Occasional instances appear, however, of excellent taste in dress, particularly among the young women. The young men, however, deck themselves out loudly and clumsily. Brand-new clothes, whoever wears them, never fail to attract the attention of the neighbors. When Jack O'Toole appeared in his first long-trousered suit, a new derby hat, a standing collar and an ambitious tie that nothing could keep from climbing the collar, every one took note and guyed him merci-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lessly. Old Mag Maguire, "happy Mag," the street calls her, drunk as she was, saw the humor of the situation and plastered him with burdocks in her mirth. All day long, poor Jack's face betrayed his misery, and his attempts to appear manly grievously miscarried.

Grown-up married children come home to the Sunday dinner. Here and there a devoted mother reads aloud stories of the saints to her children. Excursions are made by a few to the parks and the beaches. Many are attracted to the theatres by the "sacred concerts," or stereopticon lectures in the evening. Most important and distinctive of all are the church services—early mass from 6 to 6.30, low mass from 9 to 9.30, high mass from 10.30 to 12; and to one or another of these services nearly every Catholic finds his way.

Such is the summer life of Bulfinch Street. The winter life is not essentially different. The principal scene of action is then transferred from outdoors to indoors. There is a little less sociability and poverty gripes harder—that is all.

IV. Morals.

Of the moral side of Bulfinch Street something must be said. The saddest feature of the life is, oddly enough, the very thing that makes it superficially bright,—the perfect content with a low standard of living which springs from an extreme poverty of ideals. This is evidenced by nothing so much as the ignoble things that kindle pride. The men, in particular, take their drudgery unquestioningly, though they feel no pleasure in it. There is more hope of progress in the rash, anarchistic discontent prevalent in certain other poor districts. For this discontent, however misdirected, and however dangerous (for a time) to social order, has at least some upward-moving vitality in it, inspired as it is by the sense of justice which is here almost entirely lacking. One of the saddest manifestations of this sad satisfaction is a benumbing of the energies of the young, when they leave school, or when, outside incentives to work being taken from them by the necessity of bread-winning, they are left practically at the mercy of their immediate environment. Growth is at once arrested and rarely recommences. Content becomes positively as well as negatively harmful, when it results, as it does here, in a moral denseness which amounts to an absolute inability to make distinctions,—to appreciate that anything whatever may not be done that does not bring reprisal from the priest or the policeman. And the church, in spite of its uplifting power along many lines, seems to be partially responsible for this.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Once this moral denseness is appreciated most of the moral defects of the people are easily understood. The most salient of these and, by all odds, the most disastrous is untruthfulness. Among themselves in their simple, neighborhood life, the people of Bulfinch Street are so natural and so loyal that frankness and honesty prevail to a large degree, partly, perhaps, because there is so little to be gained by crookedness that it has not seemed worth while. But their relation to so much of the outside world as they are in any way physically dependent on—principally employers, landlords and the visitors and agents of charitable societies—is one tangled web of deceit. Anything and everything asked is freely promised: in part, it may be, out of a false notion that a refusal of any kind is not good breeding. But promises once made are done with; thereafter they are naïvely ignored. Successful perjury is venial. Mrs. Jenkins, for instance, almost begged to be allowed to swear in court that her Frank was a hopelessly stubborn child. She was really proud of his being quite the reverse. But she desired to have him committed for stubbornness instead of truancy, her reason being a more or less well-grounded preference for the institution to which stubborn children are sent to the one devoted to truants. That in perjuring herself thus she would not be doing a mother's full duty she never had a glimmering. Men and women, unasked, assert that they would not touch a drop of liquor for the world, though they drink as a matter of course and are, at bottom, not ashamed of it. They have learned by hard experience that there is an absurd lack of distinction on the part of their would-be benefactors between drinking and habitual drunkenness. It is only natural that they should utilize their dearly earned knowledge to the best advantage. The parents, of course, are imitated by the children. More than that, many of the children are forced to be steady deceivers for the benefit of the parental purse.

One is obliged to wonder how much of this chronic untruthfulness is due to real moral depravity and how much to well-meant intermeddling in their affairs by the well-to-do; since this intermeddling has not only made it pay well to deceive, but, as in trampdom, has made success in deceit a thing to be mightily proud of. Temptations to easy living are hard to resist and are none too much resisted in any grade of life. These people must not be judged too harshly for yielding to their peculiar temptation. This easy lapsing into deceit may be in some degree a matter of race, but that it is not entirely so is plain enough from the fact that it is as pronounced in the other fam-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ilies of Bulfinch Street as in the Irish families. It is certain that the charities are responsible for a part of it. It is equally certain that there is little hope of developing integrity in Bulfinch Street, until private charitable impulse, instead of indulging in the exquisite luxury of giving, shall practise the difficult self-denial of leaving the people there, in matters of finance, to their own natural, noble village communism. It may as well be confessed, also, that many of the charity visitors have resorted to diabolical sharp practice in ferreting out damaging facts under the guise of friendship. These have found apt pupils, so apt that they are now being fleeced by their own tricks. Servility, another striking defect, is really only another phase of this deceit used for commercial ends. Flattery and cajolery have been put at a high premium, as well as direct deceit, by being too often mistaken for gratitude and bountifully rewarded as such.

Energy and persistence—strenuousness of every sort—is lacking. But this may be so far due to purely physical causes that it is hardly safe to treat it from the moral point of view. Overwork and poor food alone are enough to undermine any sort of original sinew.

Intemperance is found in both sexes, and as much in the one sex as in the other. Speaking broadly, everybody drinks more or less. A majority, it may be, drink to excess now and then. On Christmas or on the Fourth of July it is *comme il faut* to be drunk. But this is not habitual drunkenness nor anything like it. Habitual drunkards are, unquestionably, in a small minority. A few of the boys, however, are already inebriates. Only the other day two, fourteen years of age, were sentenced to a considerable term for drunkenness. The causes of intemperance are many, but the chief are bad food, overwork, unemployment, poverty, ugliness on the part of the husbands, shrewishness and slatternliness of the wives, and "pure cussedness."

Sexual immorality exists here as everywhere, but it is not common enough to be appalling. There are no houses of prostitution. There are loose women who, as the neighbors express it, "have men hanging round them," and there are some couples living in *union libre*. The home-life of the latter, however, cannot truthfully be said to be any less well-ordered than that of their more conventional neighbors. Mrs. Brannigan's Jenny, aged thirty-three, is officially known by the name of Mrs. Duncan, from Jim Duncan, with whom she has been living for several years; but her three children all bear the name of Brannigan. Rosa Brackett, now twenty-one, at fourteen a homeless orphan in a dance-hall, was taken in by John Belasco

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and given a home. She has lived with him ever since. They have two children. In conversation, the people have a refreshing habit of calling a spade a spade. Pregnancy is nothing to be ashamed of, and does not force retirement from society. Conventional sensibilities would be shocked by the vulgarisms of Bulfinch Street, but deliberate obscenity is not more common than among the better to-do.

It has been the purpose of this study to show what is, not what ought to be, in Bulfinch Street. A detailed programme of reform would be grotesquely out of place here. But the conclusion forces itself that the social elevation of Bulfinch Street, if it is to be achieved at all, will be achieved most quickly and most easily by an open-minded, inquiring, humble coöperation with its healthy native forces —more especially sociability and neighborly helpfulness. If these forces may somehow be directed so as to come into vital contact with new ideas, the standard of living will be raised all along the line and life will be splendidly enriched. The natural and the best way of bringing about this vital contact, since the local feeling as well as the lethargy of Bulfinch Street forbid reaching far out after the ideas, is to bring the ideas to it. This involves the opening of Bulfinch Street branches for the dissemination of the ideas of the larger life—local centres of learning, manual and technical training, the fine arts, morals, religion (using the term broadly). In this enterprise, neighborhood traits must be appreciated, neighborhood tradition reverenced, and neighborhood pride and support appealed to. This, if anything, will prevent growth from being arrested; may even cause it to recommence where it has been arrested. If these conditions are fulfilled and the affair be absolutely divorced from charity, it is a matter of little difference how or by whom these local centres are established.

If, however, this raising of the standard of living of Bulfinch Street necessarily involves the loss of its splendid human qualities, it is hardly worth while. The stupid, comfortable, self-satisfied, unsocial respectability of the city middle classes is not a result to make large sacrifices for. There are those who love Bulfinch Street as it is, and these pray that, whatever else may happen to it, it may not come to that. The world has enough of that sort of thing already.

ALVAN F. SANBORN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CRUX OF THE MONEY CONTROVERSY: HAS GOLD RISEN?

THAT gold has acquired in recent years a greatly increased purchasing-power or command over commodities, no one is insane enough to deny; but that it has been the result of any change in economic or industrial conditions operating directly upon the metal-mass itself, no one will admit who has investigated the subject with the single purpose of ascertaining the facts underlying the phenomenon. Its explanation, therefore, should be sought for, by inductive methods, among the complex industrial conditions which have produced a fall in prices, and not by an arbitrary or gratuitous assumption, based on mere illation, that such a fall is the result of an appreciation of gold. When this shall have been done it will undoubtedly appear that the alleged appreciation is simply *an effect* resulting from, and not *a cause* producing, the phenomena observed.

At the very threshold we are confronted with a fact that admonishes us of the dangers of hasty conclusions. It is not to be denied that gold is, of all known substances, the least subject to changes either physical or economic. It possesses all the elements of stability of value in a more eminent degree than any other product of nature, or than any product of man's ingenuity. It is, therefore, preeminently suited to the purposes of a "standard" measure of value, whose paramount and most essential characteristics are immutability and exemption from physical and economic changes.

At the next step of our inquiry we encounter another important fact scarcely less discouraging to the theory that gold has risen. And this is, that within the period in which it is alleged this change has occurred—say since 1865, the year following that in which prices attained their highest point both in this country and Europe—we find that while there was, for a time, a decline in the product of gold of about 10 per cent as compared with the phenomenal output for the first fifteen years following its discovery in California and Australia, there was an increase of 100 per cent in the product of silver during the same period, and a combined increase of both metals of 16 per cent. And yet, within the period of fifteen years following that of the maximum product of gold—and during this increase of the joint

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

output—prices both in this country and Europe fell to the lowest point of the century up to that date, 1878. We find further that, following this temporary decline in the product of gold, a very notable increase in that metal occurred, nearly equalling for the past eight years the average of the maximum product for the fifteen years from 1851 to 1865, and for the past three years exceeding it by over $12,000,000 per annum; while, for the past eight years silver has increased, as compared with the same period, over 300 per cent; and the joint increase has been 70 per cent in excess of the product of the period of maximum output, and for the past three years, 100 per cent.

Adopting Dr. Soetbeer's tables up to and including 1879, and the tables of the Director of the Mint since that date, we find that for the twenty-eight years from 1866 to 1893—the period of the so-called "contraction of the currency," and of falling values—the world's product of gold exceeded $3,276,000,000, or $116,000,000 *in excess of the product for 358 years* from the discovery of America to the year 1851; while the product of silver aggregated $3,063,000,000, making a joint output of $6,339,000,000, or an excess of over $3,781,000,000, or 150 per cent, as compared with the joint product from 1851 to 1865, the period of maximum output in the history of the metals to that date, and of the inflated prices alleged to have resulted therefrom. This excess greatly exceeds the increase of either commerce or population for the same period, and if there is any foundation for the theory that prices are dependent upon the volume of money in circulation as compared with the volume of the commodities upon the market, then prices should have advanced to a figure never before witnessed in modern times; instead of which there has been a depression wholly unexampled.

It may not be uninteresting to give here a *résumé* of the product of the metals for the century, as it may afford some idea of the alleged "contraction" that has occurred and upon which the theories of existing industrial depression have been founded. We state the annual average product of each metal, the combined average output, and the total product for the period designated:

Period.	Annual average output—gold.	Annual average output—silver.	Total annual average.	Total product—gold and silver.
1801–50, 50 years...	$15,750,164	$27,205,424	$42,955,588	$2,147,779,407
1851–65, 15 " ...	130,428,400	40,086,400	170,514,800	2,557,723,000
1866–80, 15 " ...	118,217,310	79,887,606	198,104,916	2,971,580,736
1866–93, 28 " ...	117,002,855	109,391,682	226,394,537	6,339,047,036
1886–93, 8 " ...	124,039,162	163,944,250	287,983,412	2,303,866,300
1891–93, 3 " ...	142,667,766	197,190,666	339,858,432	1,019,575,300

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The mint reports of leading commercial nations show that the coinage of the metals considerably exceeds their total output, to say nothing of the amount consumed in the arts. But this is so largely due to recoinage, that it is impossible to ascertain the net annual additions to the stock of metallic money. As, however, the consumption in the arts does not greatly differ from year to year, it is believed that a statement of the output will indicate, with sufficient accuracy, the relative supply of metallic money.

But whatever serves the purpose of effecting exchanges and distributing the products of industry, practically performs the functions of money and, to that extent, relieves the pressure of "demand" upon the money-mass. And we find that, within this period of falling prices, the increase of uncovered paper money, which, though a mere arbitrary "sign of value," subserves the purpose of effecting local exchanges, has been even more remarkable than the increase of metallic money, and is altogether unprecedented in monetary history. To this, we may add also the abnormal increase of "banking power" among leading commercial nations within the same period, which, though not necessarily involving an increase of the money-mass, creates a powerful agency for effecting exchanges and facilitating the operations of borrowing by the aggregation of small savings and the utilization of credits based upon material wealth, and, to that extent, increases the effectiveness of the currency.

Hume, in explaining the circumstances which tend to reduce the rates of interest, has well elucidated this idea. He says:

> "In order to have in any State a great number of lenders, it is not sufficient nor requisite that there be a great abundance of the precious metals. It is only requisite that the property or command of that quantity which is in the State should be collected in particular hands, so as to form considerable sums, or compose a great moneyed interest. This begets a number of lenders and sinks the rate of usury."

And Mulhall tells us that "since 1840 the banking of the world has increased about eleven-fold, that is, three times as fast as commerce, or thirty times faster than population."

If, to these instrumentalities, we add the vast sums represented by the bills of exchange arising from the phenomenal expansion of commerce and travel within the same period, or growing out of the enormous carrying trade of the world incident thereto—the underwritten risks—international dealings in funded securities, foreign loans and speculative stocks, all which, to a greater or less extent, perform the functions of money in the transfer of credits and the liquidation of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

balances, we shall have a volume of the various "signs of value" wholly unexampled in the history of the world. The logical tendency of this should have been to produce a rise in prices or, *e converso*, a fall in the value of money. On the contrary, we are confronted with a great fall in prices, as alleged, from an appreciation of gold.

As these things all tend directly to relieve the pressure upon the money-mass, we are unable to discover anything in the economic conditions of the past twenty-five years tending at all to an appreciation of gold. As heretofore observed, the exchangeable value of that metal, like that of other commodities, arises from its utilities; chief among which are its uses as a "standard measure" of value in liquidating the balances of international commerce, or of rating the exchanges which arise from it. It has already been shown that six times the amount of gold is employed in foreign commerce that is so used for local circulation and the arts combined. And to the extent to which it has been superseded for such purposes by these various instrumentalities, has its "utility" been impaired; and the logical effect would be its *depreciation*, or fall in value.

But there is yet another, and even more important, consideration to be taken into account, tending to the same result. We allude now to the immensely increased *effectiveness* of gold as a medium of exchange, both in foreign and domestic commerce, arising from the increased rapidity in the transfer of credits resulting from the increased facilities of rapid transit by ocean cables, telegraph, railway and steamship service. They have not only minimized the time required for the transfer of credits, but have greatly multiplied the operations of exchange by cross bills and arbitrages which the perfected mechanism of commercial methods, incident to these improved facilities, have made practical. Fortunately, this is not a matter of theory or speculation, but is susceptible of absolute proof.

Immediately following the cessation, in 1866, of the abnormal exports of silver to the Orient, which had been draining Europe since 1853, a series of events followed in rapid succession that not only revolutionized Oriental exchanges that had so long controlled the market price of silver, but also produced important modifications in the commercial methods of the Western world. In that year the Atlantic cable was laid, connecting Europe with this continent. Three years later, in 1869, the Suez canal was opened and cable communication was established throughout the Orient. During the same year, the golden spike was driven in our first transcontinental railway,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the steamship line from San Francisco to China was established. In the meantime continents were being ribbed with railways, the atmosphere was being webbed with telegraph wires connecting every important commercial centre, and in this girding together of hemispheres and continents with cables, the whole commercial world may be said to have become one vast clearing-house whose daily transactions were flashed to every financial centre—relieving financial tension and adjusting balances by the instantaneous transfer of credits that, within a few years, had required weeks, and in many instances months, to effect. The industrial development and commercial expansion that followed this revolution in commercial methods imparted unwonted energy to every department of human industry, the substantial and visible evidences of which are to be found in the unparalleled increase of the material wealth of the world within the last thirty years.

Following, now, this line of inquiry, let us see what was the effect of these important changes upon the movements of the precious metals in the adjustment of the balances of international commerce, for which we are now told the supply of gold has become inadequate. For this purpose we will compare the "movement" of the merchandise commerce, *i.e.*, the gross imports and exports, of Great Britain, France, the United States, and British India—aggregating over 40 per cent of the commerce of the world—for the quinquennial periods of 1860 to 1864 and 1886 to 1890, the one just preceding, and the other closing with, the period of falling prices and industrial depression. We will state also, for the corresponding periods, the movement of treasure and its percentage of the merchandise moved, as well as the world's product of gold and silver. It is deserving of notice that during the first period the movement of silver was 40 per cent of the whole, while in the latter it was 45 per cent; showing, that notwithstanding its alleged demonetization as a currency, it still continued to perform its functions as a commodity in commerce, which has always been its chief use. And it would doubtless have been still greater but for the large amount of overvalued coin held by this country and France, which is excluded from international commerce in consequence of the heavy "seigniorage" with which it is charged:

Period.	Movement of merchandise.	Movement of specie.	Per cent. of specie moved to merchandise moved.	Product of gold and silver.
1860–64	$18,568,736,213	$3,143,656,271	17	$792,350,000
1886–90	36,204,527,385	2,717,334,783	7½	1,284,291,000
Difference	$17,635,791,172	$426,321,488	9½	491,941,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The increase of merchandise moved was 95 per cent; the decrease of specie moved was 13 per cent; the decrease of the percentage of specie to merchandise was 9½ per cent; and the increase of the production of gold and silver was 62 per cent.

To show, now, what has been the economizing effect of the improved mechanism of international exchanges and the increased efficiency of the metals in effecting them, we have but to make a very simple calculation. If the merchandise moved during the latter period—1886–1890—had required the same amount of specie for the settlement of its balances as in the first period—1860–1864—(17 per cent) then the commerce of these four countries alone would have required about $6,155,000,000 for that purpose—an amount equal to *the entire product of the world for the thirty-one years from 1860 to 1890*. But they actually employed only $2,717,000,000, or $3,438,000,000 less. This is equivalent to an increased efficiency of 126 per cent in the amount of specie employed.

But let us reverse the calculation. At 17 per cent, the $2,717,000,000 of specie actually employed in the latter period, would have moved something *less* than $16,000,000,000 of merchandise; whereas, it actually did move over $36,200,000,000, or $20,200,000,000 *more*. As compared with the first period, this amount of merchandise was, therefore, apparently moved *without the employment of a dollar of specie*. Or, in other words, to that extent, the metals only served the purpose of "standards" of value for rating the exchanges which were "settled" by cross bills and arbitrages, and not by the payment of specie, or the direct employment of gold. It will be observed that this excess of merchandise moved is, also, equivalent to an increase of 126 per cent, and, of itself, is nearly $2,000,000,000 *greater than the entire commerce* of the countries designated, during the first period. We thus have, then, for the period covered by these movements, an actual increase of 62 per cent in the joint product of the metals, and 126 per cent in increased effectiveness, or 188 per cent in both volume and effectiveness; as against 95 per cent increase of commerce, and less than 40 per cent increase of population.

But the countries designated are much above the average of the commercial world in the movement of the metals relatively to commerce, as their exchanges were largely for account of other nations. While for these other nations we cannot now ascertain these movements for the first period, there is no difficulty in doing so for the second. We have, therefore, selected eleven of the more important

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these countries, which, during the latter period, moved about the same amount of merchandise as the four countries first designated. We find that it aggregated something over $36,100,000,000 in merchandise, but less than $940,000,000 in specie, or $2\frac{6}{10}$ per cent, instead of $7\frac{1}{2}$ as in the case of the first group, during the latter period. For the remaining countries the movement was doubtless still less. We may, therefore, safely assume that for the fifteen countries designated, representing fully 90 per cent of the commerce of the world, the average movement of specie during the latter period did not exceed 5 per cent of the merchandise. Of this, about 60 per cent was gold and 40 per cent silver, which would give us about 3 per cent for the former, as compared with the movement of merchandise commerce.

But if we take into account the vast volume of international exchanges heretofore indicated, as arising from operations other than those pertaining to the movement of merchandise, it will be readily perceived that gold does not directly effect 2 per cent of the international exchanges of the world, and, to the extent of 98 per cent, serves only the purposes of a "standard of value" by which they are rated. Its functions, therefore, in such cases are only those of "numeration and arithmetic," which was the Scythian philosopher's idea of money among the Greeks, as quoted by Hume. Its employment, therefore, for such a purpose, produces no more effect upon the exchangeable value of the metal as a commodity, and exerts no more influence upon prices, than the fluctuations in value of dry-goods would have upon the length of a yard-stick, or the speed of a train of cars would have upon the length of a mile. It simply performs the functions of a numeral in estimating value, and not as a material recompense or exchangeable equivalent, as when employed as a "measure" of value. For as such, it can be as readily made to express a thousand millions as a single unit, and, as heretofore explained, would as effectively perform that function if it were only a theoretical unit by weight, as in the form of coined money which in such cases is only regarded as a commodity.

When, therefore, writers upon the science of money undertake to establish mathematical relations between the volume of circulation and general price-levels within given periods of time, they strangely overlook or disregard the obvious considerations which arise from the fact that the exchanges effected by metallic money, considered simply as a "standard" of value, vastly exceed those effected by it as a "measure" of value in which it becomes the exchangeable equiva-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lent of the things it measures. They apparently fall into the error of reasoning upon the hypothesis that all the exchanges effected are cash transactions, and thus ignore that vast volume of operations that are effected by mere credits, and are ultimately liquidated by the "unearned increments" of trade when realized at a future day. This fundamental law, as they are pleased to call it, also eliminates from the calculation all those factors which arise from the numberless vicissitudes and contingencies which beset industry and its products, but in no wise affect the stability of money. It is, therefore, nothing but a postulated fallacy, for which no verification can be found in commercial history. The examples relied upon prove, upon investigation, to be mere coincidences and can be clearly traced to other causes. It is equally at variance with the fact that while metallic money possesses an unlimited self-repeating power in effecting exchanges, both as a "standard" and a "measure" of value, commodities soon reach the ultimate consumer, and disappear from the market. Its effectiveness, therefore, depends much more largely upon the density of population, the subdivisions of labor and the diversity of its products, the activity of trade and the facilities of rapid transit, than upon its volume. When these obvious and important considerations are taken into account, it will not be difficult to detect the fallacy that underlies the specious formulation of this moss-covered paralogism of "economic science," incrusted though it be with "high authority." So palpable is this fallacy that it would be altogether undeserving of notice, did it not constitute the basis upon which bimetallists have founded all their wild theories as to the origin of existing industrial depression, and the remedies they propose for it.

But there is much additional evidence to be found, indicating the great abundance of money and other signs of value that performed, in part, its functions during this period of falling values, that is wholly incompatible with the idea of an appreciation or rise in value of gold. Prominent as such may be instanced the universal decline in the rates of interest in all the financial centres of the world, as indicated by the rise in value of funded securities. In this connection we may quote the sagacious observations of Hume in his chapter on "Interest":

"If we consider the whole connection of causes and effects, interest is the barometer of the State, and its lowness is a sign almost infallible of the flourishing condition of a people. . . . Those who have asserted that the plenty of money was the cause of low interest, seem to have taken a collateral effect for a cause; since the same industry which sinks the interest commonly acquires great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abundance of the precious metals. . . . But though both of these effects, plenty of money and low interest, naturally arise from commerce and industry, they are altogether independent of each other."

In whatever aspect, then, we view the subject—whether from the physical properties of the metal and its comparative immunity from change either economic or physical, whether upon the line of the industrial phenomena resulting from its produce and distribution, or as a controlling instrumentality of international commerce—we fail, alike, to discover anything in the economic conditions prevailing during this period of falling values tending in the slightest degree to an enhancement of the value of gold. We are thus, again, brought squarely to the question, Has gold appreciated or risen in value? or, Is the apparent phenomenon of its increased purchasing power the mere assumption of an effect for a cause, or the substitution of a mere theory for a material fact? It is assumed that prices depend upon the volume of money in circulation as compared with the exchanges to be effected by it. Prices, we are told, have fallen—*ergo*, the volume of money has been "contracted." Silver is money, silver has been demonetized—*ergo*, demonetization is the cause of "contraction" and of the fall in prices. Such seems to be the logic, the Alpha and the Omega, the Genesis and Apocalypse of the inspired economic wisdom and revelation of economic truth upon which it is proposed to found the most far-reaching and radical changes in our monetary policy.

There is an important technical difference between a "standard" and a "measure" of value which, though independent in the nature of their functions, become often united in the operations of exchange. As heretofore explained, gold, considered as a "standard," is not necessarily a coin, and is to be regarded only as an immutable unit of magnitude that does not express any "relation" of value to other commodities, but with reference to which all other things either rise or fall in value in accordance with the economic conditions affecting the question of "supply and demand." There is a wise maxim of the Roman law that has come down to us from the "Institutes," that fully recognizes this essential principle, and which declares that "things are estimated by their value in money; but money is not estimated by its value in things" (*Res per pecuniam æstimantur, et non pecunia per res*). The obvious justness of this maxim will be at once accepted by all who recognize the technical nature of a standard of value as it relates to the terminology of monetary science, as well

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as to those exact methods of reasoning which are essential to intelligent action in our daily transactions.

All idea of fixity or immutability in a standard of value must be abandoned if we are to go back to the primitive methods of barter, and gold coins, as standards of value, are to be regarded *only* as exchangeable commodities whose "value" is to be determined by the "relations of value" that subsist between them and other commodities with which they may be compared or for which they may become exchangeable. In that event, instead of having one fixed and unalterable standard, we should have a hundred or more different standards, all varying from day to day, and all depending upon different economic conditions, which, for the time being, would be wholly unknown but which would give us a hundred or more different values of money at one and the same time, and yet no one would be able to determine what its true value was until he had gone through an elaborate and impossible process of ascertaining the so-called "general average" of the aggregate "relations of value" subsisting between money and the various commodities which had participated in the transactions of trade at any given time. The moment we lose sight of the essential principle of absolute *fixity* in a standard of value, with reference to which all other things only rise or fall, and assume that such a standard is the thing which rises or falls in value in accordance with the constant variations of commodities, which are subject to an infinite number of contingencies,—we enter a realm of limitless speculation wholly incompatible with any logical analysis of economic phenomena. And it must be seen that the whole of this theory of the appreciation of gold is thus made to rest entirely upon a process of reasoning which wholly disregards the innumerable contingencies to which the products of industry are subject, and which, to a greater or less extent, affect prices favorably or otherwise.

Whether gold has risen in value or not, possesses but little significance as an abstract question, and is important only in so far as it relates to the assumption that it has resulted from "contraction" of the currency produced by demonetization of silver, and becomes the basis of a dangerous change of policy founded upon that conclusion. All true theories of economic science are formulated upon a concretion of observed facts as developed by industrial and commercial phenomena, while this assumption eliminates from the diagnosis of existing maladies all those economic, physical, and social factors which so largely control the phenomena observed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In attempting, therefore, to discover the true cause of the general fall in prices, or of the industrial and commercial depression resulting therefrom, it is important to consider those portentous changes that have occurred in the economic conditions of the past quarter of a century affecting, for better or for worse, all the activities of human industry. Among these we may enumerate, as specially applying to this country, the enormous increase of productive energy, by reason of the abnormal increase of population which, by immigration alone, exceeds that of thirteen such States as the State of Maine—an empire within itself. Within the same period there have been issued over 430,000 patents for new inventions and labor-saving devices, immensely stimulating, while reducing the cost of, production. To these agencies may be added an abnormal increase in the facilities of rapid-transit, exceeding 440 per cent, since 1860, greatly cheapening the cost of transportation, while stimulating competition among home producers by making all the industrial and commercial centres accessible to all sections of the country, and, to that extent, reducing prices. Within the forty years from 1850 to 1890, while population in this country increased but 170 per cent, foreign imports increased 346 per cent, domestic manufactures 820 per cent, wheat 366 per cent, all cereal crops 305 per cent, raw cotton 267 per cent, horses 278 per cent, horned cattle (not including milch cows) 221 per cent; thus showing a mean average increase of more than 200 per cent in excess of the increase of population.

If, then, the law of "supply and demand" possesses any potency or influence in determining general price-levels, here would seem to be a partial solution, at least, of the phenomenon of falling prices, wholly independent of any question pertaining to the supply of money or its relations to the volume of commodities dealt in.

But, apart from these obvious considerations, every so-called table of prices, compiled for the purpose of indicating the general rise or fall of the same within given periods of time, is radically defective and misleading in so far as it substitutes for a true average a mere numerical mean of a given number of incommensurate units of quantity, and respective prices, varying from a few cents to hundreds of dollars per unit, the true average of which is not infrequently the very reverse of the result shown. For it is scarcely necessary to state that any general average of prices that does not determine the relative proportion of each commodity to the aggregated volume of all the commodities embraced, and which it is impossible to ascertain from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ordinary market quotations, must be fatally defective, and can, at best, indicate only the general *course* of prices downward or upward as the case may be. And this is proved by the fact that all such tabulations present precisely the same phenomena.

They all show that while some commodities have risen, others have fallen. And they show, as often as otherwise, that those that have risen were produced, wholly or in part, as raw products, from those that had fallen, and *vice versa*—thus clearly proving that the fluctuations are not the result of any *uniform* law—such as contraction of the currency, as alleged,—but arise from complex industrial, social, and physical conditions operating with greater or less energy upon the several industries represented.

To determine, therefore, whether the increased purchasing-power of gold has resulted from a change in economic conditions affecting the metal itself, or its relations to industry and commerce, or, upon the contrary, is due to the numberless and complex conditions which affect only the products of industry, it is not sufficient to compare it merely with the price levels of *perishable* commodities which are affected by such a vast number of contingencies and conditions that are purely fortuitous in nature; but it should be compared with the more permanent forms of property that constitute material wealth, and which, by nature, are comparatively exempt from the casualties to which perishable commodities are subject, and which, therefore, possess to a greater or less extent those elements of stability which have always characterized gold itself.

It was suggested by some of the earlier writers upon political economy that human labor would furnish the best basis for a standard of value. And while it was shown that such a "standard" would be subject to many insuperable objections, it is undoubtedly true that both "capitalized" and "wage" labor, that enter so largely into the value of all the products of human industry, furnish a much more stable standard of comparison than many of the perishable commodities that are employed for that purpose.

If, then, we compare the value of gold, as measured by its purchasing power, with the prices of leading funded securities founded upon material wealth and national credit—with farming-lands, towns and city property—or with the wages of labor as paid in leading industries, and which, in this country alone, largely exceed *annually* all the metallic money of the world, we shall find that so far from gold having "appreciated" or risen in value during the period of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"falling prices" designated, it has *perceptibly depreciated and shows a marked loss of purchasing-power*. This will be clearly indicated by the following statement of the value of farming-land and live stock and the wages of factory-hands as shown by the census returns for the past forty years:[1]

	Farm Lands.		Live Stock.	
	Gross value.	Value per acre.	Gross value.	Value per head.
1850.....	$3,272,000,000	$11.14	$544,000,000	$7.28
1860.....	6,645,000,000	16.27	1,089,000,000	12.24
1880.....	10,197,000,000	19.02	1,577,000,000	13.03
1890.....	13,279,000,000	21.31	2,419,000,000	14.63

There is no way of determining the increased value of town and city property, but it is within the knowledge of every intelligent person that it has been relatively much greater than that of farming-lands.

Annual Wages Paid in the Factories of the United States.

	No. of employees.	Total wages paid.	Average per capita.
1850.....	957,059	$236,755,464	$247
1860.....	1,311,246	378,878,966	288
1880.....	2,732,595	947,953,795	346
1890.....	4,711,832	2,282,823,265	484

While we cannot ascertain definitely the increase of wages in other industries, it is known to be very considerable. We find, for example, that in 1880, 286,593 teachers in public schools received an average salary of $195 per annum, while in 1890, 363,922 teachers received an average of $251—equivalent to an increase of nearly 30 per cent. Railroad traffic also furnishes further proofs of the general rise in wages. The census year of 1889, as compared with that of 1879, shows that the "operating expenses" of the rail system of the United States rose from something less than 58 per cent of gross earnings, to over 66 per cent; and they increased nearly 24 per cent in excess of the increase of earnings. And while this increase in percentage is, to some extent, due to the reduction in rates of transportation, operating expenses consist so largely of labor that it is evident that a marked increase of wages in this important branch of traffic must have taken place.

[1] We omit the census of 1870 for the reason that, apart from its being one of the most defective ever taken—bearing internal evidence of glaring inaccuracies—all values are given *in currency*, which was then at a considerable discount. And as the premium on gold fluctuated daily, while prices were not changed more than two or three times a year, any attempt to reduce census values to a gold basis would be grossly misleading. The increased valuations of 1880, therefore, represent the increase of two decades.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If, in addition to these evidences of the loss of purchasing power of gold, we consider the increased value of funded securities, as measured by the rates of interest on market prices, representing, as they do, such vast investments of capital,—it is difficult to see how the conclusion is to be evaded, that the value of gold, *as compared with all the more stable and permanent forms of material wealth, has perceptibly depreciated.* And, as we indicated at the outset, the explanation of the phenomenon of a fall in prices must be sought among those complex economic conditions which arise from the physical or social forces to which industry and commerce are subject, *wholly independent of their relations to existing monetary conditions.*

Conceding this, it necessarily follows that the whole fabric of economic fallacies that has been reared upon the basis of this synthetic theory of industrial depression vanishes into thin air, and the imposing array of unassimilated facts and unconnected theories by which the attempt has been made to sustain it becomes a mass of mere postulated vagaries, born of empiricism and nurtured by popular delusion.

Louis A. Garnett.

San Francisco, California.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PAY AND RANK OF JOURNALISTS.

JOURNALISM in the United States had its beginning in 1690, when an adventurous citizen of Boston printed the country's first newspaper, and was promptly forbidden by the colonial authorities to issue a second number. As late as 1775, the number of papers in the country was only thirty-nine,—all weekly but one, which was semi-weekly. The Revolution was fought and independence gained without a single daily newspaper. There were journalists at that time merely in a groping and premonitory sense.

It is easy to understand that papers were not multiplied in those days because they were profitable. As a rule, they hardly paid expenses, and had in their outlook no logic of continuance. The field was restricted, the conditions precarious, and competition close and disheartening. When an editor was made a postmaster, as sometimes graciously happened, it was chiefly gratifying to him on account of the opportunity that it furnished to improve his newspaper and to take patronage away from a rival one. Most of the papers were chronically in debt. The proprietors, who were also the editors, resorted to all kinds of devices for driving the wolf from the door. Franklin proposed to marry a young lady, whose parents had permitted his attentions, if they would furnish him five hundred dollars to pay off a mortgage on his office; but they refused, saying that the business was a poor one, that the types would soon wear out and new ones would be wanted, and that his failure was only a question of time. However, the newspapers kept on increasing in spite of all drawbacks and vicissitudes until in 1830 they numbered a thousand.

When De Tocqueville visited the country in 1831, he noted the fact that almost every hamlet had its newspaper, which he accounted for mainly by the influence of the liberty of the press, and the absence of licenses, securities, and stamp duties. "The facility with which newspapers can be established," he said, "produces a multitude of them"; but he went on to point out that the competition prevented any considerable profit, and thus deterred "persons of much capacity" from engaging in such undertakings. Even if they had been a source

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of wealth, he suggested, writers of ability could not have been found to conduct them all. "The journalists of the United States," he declared, "are generally in very humble position, with a scanty education and a vulgar turn of mind." He had no indulgence for their "open and coarse appeals to the passions of their readers," their neglect of principles in order to assail the characters of individuals, which he pronounced to be "a deplorable abuse of the powers of thought." It seems strange that with his fine sagacity he did not discover the extenuating circumstances in the case. The American press had then barely passed the elementary period. It was still comparatively tentative, and more or less at the mercy of its own undisciplined energies. There was as yet really no profession of journalism; there were no journalists in the true meaning of the term. The papers were principally devoted to political controversy, and most of them were directed by men who regarded them exclusively as means to ends in that relation.

In the memorable political campaign of 1840 there were 1,400 papers to stimulate public interest and advocate the claims of the contending parties. The staff of the larger daily had been increased from an editor who wrote the leaders, corrected the communications and read the proofs, with an assistant who did the local work, to two editors and two reporters, whose compensation was about the same in an average sense as that received by the stage-drivers of the period. Most of the smaller dailies and a majority of the weeklies lived in a hand-to-mouth fashion, and salaries were contingent upon receipts adapted to a low tone of expectation. Horace Greeley concluded, as the result of experience in this campaign, "that the right sort of a cheap Whig journal would be able to live," and so he started one, printing 5,000 copies of it and "nearly succeeding in giving away all of them that would not sell." The idea proved to be contagious. There was a gradual cheapening of rates; and a corresponding increase of patrons ensued.

Then came the telegraph and the railroad to accelerate newspaper progress, and put the business upon a substantial basis. The principal dailies had four editors and five reporters each. There was one salary of $2,500 per year to attest the commercial reputability of journalism and to fire the ambition of the profession—for it had now become a profession to the extent that it represented chances of steady employment, and required certain technical qualifications for the performance of its duties. But the papers with receipts larger than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their expenditures were yet exceptional. Where there was one in that happy state, there were twenty that hovered on the verge of bankruptcy and could be kept going only by peculiar fertility in financial expedients. Generally speaking, there was a suggestion of indigence associated with the press. The editor was looked upon in a degree as a pensioner, and a man to be pitied, and it too often happened that he was obliged to justify the estimate by humiliating appeals for assistance that a better appreciation of his services would have obviated. It is a wonder that so many of those thus situated bravely and patiently endured the stress when they could have escaped from it by consenting to be something else than journalists.

During the decade from 1850 to 1860, the number of American publications was doubled, reaching an aggregate of 4,051, including 387 dailies and 3,173 weeklies. The organization of the New York Associated Press invested news-gathering with increased importance, and signalized the feature of journalism that was eventually to make all others subordinate. More men were required year after year as writers for the papers, and they were mostly recruited from the ranks of the printers. The rates of pay advanced, in the cities, to a level with those prevailing for the better grades of mechanics; but in the towns and villages, the remuneration still remained ironically small, journalists being hired by the month, like farm-hands, and their wages, with board and washing, running from $12 to $20, part or all of which was paid in orders on the stores. Newspaper profits in those days were derived principally from subscriptions and job-printing, with the publication of the delinquent tax-list as an annual bonanza. When merchants advertised, they did it in a spirit of benevolence, as a service of charity, with the same feeling that they made donations to the cross-bearers of clerical poverty. The editor was paid grudgingly, and considered worthy of support in the proportion of his ability to be combative and vituperative, according to the prolixity of his utterances, and the measure of his facility in "goads, thorns, nettles, tails of wasps." He was expected to be continually quarrelling with other editors, and never to permit himself to be outdone in personal derision and calumniation; and as often as he fell short in this respect the dread penalty "stop my paper" began to shrivel his income.

The Civil War was the surpassing impetus of our journalism, the influence that revealed its latent possibilities and put it in the way of realizing its true potentialities. There was a great popular thirst for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

information about a contest that vitally concerned every family in the land. For each soldier that enlisted, the papers gained a new subscriber, and the aggregate increase of patronage gave them means to materially enlarge their operations, to augment their public usefulness, and to pay better prices for the work done upon them. The collection, adjustment, and dissemination of news that had never been excelled in interest and importance, and the discussion of events and issues that absorbed the attention of all classes, afforded them the opportunity to make themselves not only desirable but indispensable —not only popular but profitable. They discharged their debts, and attained the felicity of a regular balance to their credit in the bank. The people bought papers as they bought bread and other necessaries of life; the value of advertising as a business investment was discovered; and journalists were accorded a place with teachers, lawyers, and physicians in the assessment of the standing of the different pursuits. After the war closed, the advantages thus secured were retained and extended. In 1870, the publications of all kinds numbered 5,871, of which 574 were dailies and 4,295 were weeklies. The next ten years swelled the total product to 11,314, and of these 971 were dailies and 8,633 were weeklies, showing an increase of 584 of the former and 5,460 of the latter in twenty years, or more than the whole number of both that had existed ten years before.

There are now in the United States, according to the latest statistics, in round numbers, 20,000 publications, issued at varying intervals from daily to quarterly, of which 1,855 are dailies and 14,077 are weeklies. These publications are reported in the census of 1890 as representing an aggregate capital of $126,269,885, employing an average of 106,095 persons, paying wages to the amount of $68,601,532 per year, using materials that cost $38,955,322, and turning out a product valued at $179,859,750. This exhibit is to be regarded, it is proper to say, with considerable allowance for lack of full returns when the census was taken, as well as for increased business since that time; but it is approximately trustworthy and furnishes a fair general view of the financial resources and transactions of the American press. It is impossible to separate the wages account in such a way as to show what sums are respectively expended in the business, editorial, and mechanical departments; it can only be said that they grow larger in the order named, and are regulated by different theories and conditions in different localities. For similar reasons an exact statement of the pay of journalists, the established profits of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the profession as such, cannot be made. The matter has not yet been reduced to a basis of uniformity. Hardly any two papers have their staffs arranged alike, and no two papers, even in the same place, pay the same prices for given kinds of service.

To begin with Boston, where our journalism had its origin over two hundred years ago, the salaries of editors-in-chief and managing editors, the two positions being combined in some cases, range from $2,500 to $6,000. Several of the men thus employed are part-owners of the papers, as is true with respect to a large proportion of the dailies throughout the country. Editorial writers are paid from $35 to $50 per week, with an average of about $40. City editors get from $25 to $50 per week, with an average of $40. Literary and other critics are paid from $25 to $35 per week. Copy-readers average $5 per day. Some reporters do not receive over $10 per week, while others command as much as $35: the average is from $18 to $20. Space-writers, who do special work and are paid by the column, sometimes make $100 a week, but more frequently not half of that sum, and their average may be put at from $35 to $40, according to their fortune in finding acceptable material. The salary-lists in Philadelphia are about the same as those in Boston, with a few exceptional cases where personal considerations make a difference in favor of certain editors or writers. A corresponding average, less ten to fifteen per cent, prevails in Baltimore and Washington; and in the smaller cities of New England, New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey, journalists as a class, excluding amateurs and makeshifts, earn from $600 to $2,000 per year.

In New York City, the salaries are higher than anywhere else, partly because of the superior standard of proficiency, and partly because the cost of living is greater there than in any other large city. One editor-in-chief has the same salary as the President of the United States, $50,000 per year, and others receive from $10,000 to $12,000, or more than members of the Cabinet. Managing editors are paid from $100 to $150 per week, or a better compensation than that of Senators and Representatives in Congress. Editorial writers get from $50 to $75 per week as a rule, and in cases of rare ability as much as the average salary of a managing editor. City editors receive from $50 to $75 per week, and in a few instances $100. The pay of news editors is about equal to that of city editors. Literary, theatrical, and musical critics average $50 per week. Copy-readers are paid from $40 to $45 per week. Reporters earn all the way from $15 to $60

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per week, with an average of $40, and space-writers of particular talent have been known to make as much as $125 per week, though the limitation of topics and the pressure of competition usually keep their incomes down around those of the best-paid reporters. There are some writers for syndicates of newspapers, men with names that have a certain value, who earn from $5,000 to $6,000 per year; and there are others of first-class technical capacity in various lines whose salaries occasionally reach $5,000. The pay of all classes of journalists averages 10 per cent lower in Brooklyn than in New York City.

The salaries of managing editors in Chicago range from $2,500 to $7,000 per year, the average being about $4,000. Editorial writers are paid from $40 to $75 per week. Night editors get from $35 to $60 and in one case $75; copy-readers from $30 to $40. City editors are paid $40 to $60, with assistants at $30 to $40. Financial and commercial editors receive from $35 to $50; and dramatic and literary editors, who usually give a portion of their time to other work, about the same. The pay of reporters is from $15 to $35 per week, with an average of $25. One managing editor in St. Louis gets a salary of $150 per week, the largest in the country outside of New York City, and the others get from $40 to $60; editorial writers receive from $30 to $50, with one or two instances of higher figures; city editors, $35 to $40; news editors and copy-readers, $25 to $35; reporters, $12 to $35, with an average of $20. The general range in Cincinnati is 20 per cent lower than in St. Louis. In the smaller cities, where the divisions of service are not so definitely marked, the salaries run, with occasional exceptions, from $10 to $40 per week in the West, $10 to $30 in the South, and $15 to $50 on the Pacific Coast. Most of the managing editors of the dailies in these cities depend upon the profits of the business for their income.

Taking as a basis of computation the scattered data thus presented as to the pay of journalists employed on daily papers, and taking proper account of special deviations, the averages for cities of over 400,000 inhabitants, in which the journalism of the country is best organized and most significantly representative, the averages may be stated as follows: managing editors, $5,000 per year, equal to the average salary of bishops of the various churches, and only $500 less than that of brigadier-generals of the army; editorial writers, $3,500, equal to the salary of an assistant Secretary of State at Washington, and more than the average salary of college presidents; city editors, $2,500, only a little less than the salary of a secretary of legation at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one of the leading courts; news editors, copy-readers, and space-writers, $1,800, matching the pay of a captain in the army or a junior lieutenant in the navy; and reporters, $1,200, as much as the average income of the majority of those engaged in any commercial pursuit. For cities of over 200,000 and less than 400,000 inhabitants, these averages need to be lowered from 10 to 15 per cent, and for cities of less than 200,000 about 25 per cent. The average pay of journalists of all kinds on all of the dailies is to be put at $1,500. That is to say, a competent man can always earn that much, with chances of more in proportion to the degree of his ability and his ambition. The big prizes are comparatively few, as in all professions, but there are subordinate ones that are well worth striving for, and that are to be had as fast as they are earned by meritorious service.

The remuneration in daily journalism would probably be higher, at least in some departments, but for the fact that it is to a considerable extent the refuge of the mediocrity that is continually failing to make a living in the other professions. There is a certain amount of hack-work to be done on every newspaper, which calls only for the kind of talent that knows how to put simple words together as a child constructs them with alphabetical blocks, and this is eagerly seized at pot-boiling prices by clientless lawyers, patientless doctors, and parishless clergymen. These impecunious intruders seldom or never get beyond the desk of the reporter. They are in the profession, or the vestibule of it, not because they like it, or are adapted to it, but merely because it means daily bread to them. Another depressing influence in this respect is the fact that many of those who think nature intended them for journalists are mistaken, and yet they do not find it out, but continue to work for small wages wherever their limitations will permit, thereby helping to make cheapness a fixed factor in the problem of general averages. Then there are young men who would become good journalists if they had patience and perseverance, but who accept other forms of employment with the hope of improving their condition, and thus add to the considerations which unfavorably affect the adjustment of salaries, and the orderly development of values in that relation.

That branch of journalism which pertains to paid correspondents deserves separate notice. The voluntary correspondents came in at an early date, and have been sufficiently numerous ever since. A famous editor complained over a hundred and fifty years ago that the liberty of the press was construed by his subscribers as implying " that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a newspaper was like a stage-coach, in which any one who would pay had a right to a place," and this view still prevails to some extent. Every community has its spontaneous benefactors who enjoy serving it by writing communications to the papers on all kinds of subjects, not omitting the personal delinquencies of their neighbors. But such matter is now mostly consigned to the ravenous waste-basket at the editor's elbow. The correspondence that is available is that which regularly employed men supply, principally by telegraph, from different points. Those stationed at leading news-centres receive salaries of from $40 to $75 per week; the others are paid according to what they furnish, at the rate of from $5 to $6 per column. One of the St. Louis papers has the largest staff of correspondents in the country —1,500—and their earnings aggregate $60,000 per year. A great many journalists find in this sort of work the opportunity to increase their income, since preference is usually given, for obvious reasons, to men holding positions on other papers.

It is by these correspondents that the news-gathering is mainly done, which is to say that upon their alertness, discretion, and fidelity largely depends the success of the press in its most important function. The old theory that it was the chief province of the newspaper to publish political essays, and help politicians to get offices, has been exploded, and in the place of it we have the demonstrated fact that it is the essential business of a newspaper to tell daily and as accurately as possible the many-featured story of current events, with such comments as shall serve to instruct and entertain. It must pursue a ceaseless and vigilant quest for late things, novel things, interesting things; it must ransack the universe for the unexpected that is always happening somewhere. The spirit of public curiosity and anticipation is imperative and insatiable and will have what it craves. Much that is trivial creeps into the news columns, unquestionably, and that may be lamentable, but it is not the fault of the newspapers. They tell what there is to be told, not what there should be to tell. The poet Whittier, who was also an editor, was fond of relating that an old Quaker once said to him, "Greenleaf, we must accept things; we must even accept ourselves." That is the philosophy of the newspapers, modified by reasonable discrimination; and in carrying it out, the correspondents perform the principal service.

The 14,077 weekly papers in the United States include about 4,000 that are devoted to special interests—agricultural, financial, commercial, mechanical, scientific, literary, and religious—some of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which pay salaries of from $20 to $50 per week, and, in a few cases, where superior technical ability is required, $60 to $75. The others, not counting weekly editions of the dailies, are known as "country papers," and are mostly published in towns of less than 3,000 inhabitants. In cases where they employ writers, which are exceptional, they pay from $10 to $15 per week. Generally, they are owned by two partners, one of whom does all the writing and the other manages the business. The majority of these papers are good properties, with receipts averaging from $4,000 to $6,000, and profits of from $2,000 to $3,000, per year. They are obliged to render much gratuitous service, but they are duly respected and commended for it. The country editor, like his city brother, is no longer snubbed and left to the casual Samaritans. He is courted now, and feared, and he gets his pay as other folks do, and can support a family and live in his own house; and, when he dies, they bury him with flowers and music and grateful talk about what he has done for the town.

It is in this branch of the profession that the best practical experience is gained. The country printing-office is really our only school of journalism, and its graduates are found everywhere, and hold responsible positions on all the metropolitan papers. There is no other place where preparatory general training for the duties of the profession can be obtained, where a young man can learn to be an all-round journalist. In the large city offices, the division of labor, and particularly the assignment system as to reporters, tends to place men in grooves and keep them there, making them proficient in only one of various essentials, chilling their enthusiasm, and delaying and preventing their promotion. Such hindrances are unavoidable, perhaps, in the organization of newspaper forces for the accomplishment of the best results, but they are to be regretted, nevertheless, because they specialize talent that should be generalized, and detract from the advantage of thoroughness which in all professions, as well as trades, has so much to do with the matter of employment and earnings. In the country offices, on the other hand, a man plays all the parts in turn, and is drilled for every kind of work. He is not thereby made a finished journalist, competent to fill any position, but he gets a grasp of the profession as a whole, and can more readily adapt himself to its diverse requirements than one who lacks this discipline.

A comparison of the pay of journalists with the pay of the members of other professions in different parts of the country and collectively shows that journalism pays better than is commonly supposed. There

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are not so many journalists as there are lawyers and physicians with incomes of $10,000 and more per year; but there is a larger proportion of journalists than of either lawyers or physicians, with incomes ranging from $2,000 to $3,000 per year. Only a small percentage of journalists work for salaries as low as $500 per year; but there are thousands of ministers who have to be content with that meagre stipend. The average pay of teachers is only $800 per year, or little more than half as much as that of journalists employed on daily newspapers. It follows that the young man who enters journalism with an aptitude for its duties, and a disposition to compass success by deserving it, is more likely to make money and save something for a rainy day than one who selects law, medicine, theology, or teaching. He cannot hope to accumulate wealth, but he can count upon earning at all times a comfortable living, with a margin to spare for luxuries. His tasks are sure to be arduous, confining, and harassing, but fascinating in their way at the same time; and there is to be added as a point of no little importance the satisfaction of belonging to a profession that bears close and potent relations to all the interests of life, to the happiness of mankind, and the destinies of nations.

HENRY KING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOR CHURCH: RELIGION OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT.

I AM asked to give a concise account of the origin, history, and future prospects of the Labor Church.

It was the confluence of two lines of thought that led to its birth —the first religious, the second social. Compelled to abandon the evangelical Christianity in which I was brought up, the one purpose of my life became the development of a conception of religion which should be at once rational and spiritual, and which should make God a living reality in both personal and national affairs. After three years spent in Australia, America, and England, in which I struggled to solidify my ideas, and to prepare myself for a Unitarian pulpit, I had to abandon the attempt and return to business life. After three years of business life, I was driven by internal necessity to the comparative seclusion of the edge of a small country town in England. After three years in the country, God had become a reality to me—in nature, in my home, and in my own life. After another three years I found myself the minister of the Upper Brook Street Free Church in Manchester, having previously worked some eighteen months as assistant-minister to Philip Wicksteed, in London.

Although occupying a Unitarian pulpit, and immensely indebted to Unitarian friends and institutions for many privileges, I felt compelled always to avow that I could not take the Unitarian name. Unitarianism is the last word of reason, operating upon a traditional belief. It belongs to that which is passing away before the aggressive energy of the New Life. So much it is necessary to say to make my own position clear; but it is equally necessary to add that all along the line Unitarians have assisted me with a generosity which could probably be found in no other church.

On the first Sunday in June, 1890, my ministry in Manchester commenced. Before the first year was completed, the conception of the Labor Church was formed. In order to explain its formation I must take up the second line of thought.

In the three years of my life as an architect I became profoundly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dissatisfied with competition. I felt myself and my profession degraded by the conditions under which I had to work. Ardently desiring to serve my fellow-men, no amount of sophistry could convince me that my work was any true and helpful service. Others could do it as well as I could, and needed it as much to keep them and their families from want. If I succeeded in securing a client, my brother was unhappy and impoverished; if he succeeded, I was unhappy and impoverished. The thought that I might be compelled to spend my life in such ridiculous and inhuman rivalry became intolerable. The burden of it, combined with the impossibility of facing the religious problem under such conditions, drove me into the country. I could not take up the social problem seriously until the religious problem had been dealt with. If life in itself was not good, no social reform could mend it. Three years of country life gave me the beginnings of that reasoned conviction which I needed. In London I faced the social problem. The result was a slow but sure drift toward Socialism as the next step needed to approximate man's outward condition to his inward development. Hence I came to Manchester a Socialist.

Like some new St. Christopher, I sought to serve God in the person of the strongest; and that strongest I found in the Labor Movement. Here we have manifested the real vital energy of our time. Before the fierce activity of this growing force, all the old powers are bending the knee. It is a new life which demands a new interpretation; and with it to urge them forward, Religion and Science and Politics are reaching newer and truer conclusions. It is the commanding genius of our age, which on all sides compels new canons of criticism and a fresh set of rules for the Art of Life.

Here, then, it seemed to me, God was occupying his most advanced position for the further unfolding of human destiny; and on this conception it was that the Labor Church was founded. Henceforth a church, to have any reality to me, must not merely be one in which the aspirations of Labor were sympathized with; it must be a church established in the very heart of the Labor Movement.

The first Labor-Church service was held in the Chorlton Town-Hall, Manchester, on Sunday afternoon, October 4, 1891. I spoke on "The Programme of the Labor Church." The hall, which seats 600, was nearly full. The service consisted of a hymn, a reading, a prayer and an address, in the same order as at any popular service, but with a difference. The hymns were distinctly social as well as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

religious, some even bordering on the revolutionary. The reading was James Russell Lowell's poem, "On the Capture of Certain Fugitive Slaves near Washington." The prayer was entirely free from the usual phraseology. Indeed, it was applauded! On the second Sunday, Robert Blatchford, editor of the "Clarion," gave the address. The throngs who came to hear this unique master of the hearts of the people were so great as to make it impossible to go successfully through our programme. On the following Sunday we adjourned to the People's Concert Hall, with seats for 1,600 people, and I spoke to a great crowd on "God in the Labor Movement." On the next Sunday, Ben Tillett was the speaker, and so we went forward. Early in November a demand arose for organization. The following principles were then drawn up to embody the ideas on which the movement was founded; and at a special meeting called to consider the basis of our work and membership, they were explained, discussed, and unanimously accepted:

1. That the Labor Movement is a religious movement.
2. That the religion of the Labor Movement is not a class religion, but unites members of all classes in working for the abolition of commercial slavery.
3. That the religion of the Labor Movement is not sectarian or dogmatic, but free religion, leaving each man free to develop his own relations with the Power that brought him into being.
4. That the emancipation of Labor can only be realized so far as men learn both the economic and moral laws of God, and heartily endeavor to obey them.
5. That the development of personal character and the improvement of social conditions are both essential to man's emancipation from moral and social bondage.

In January, 1892, the "Labor Prophet" was started as the organ of the movement, being published monthly and sold at a penny per copy. A Labor-Church hymn-book followed, and more recently a tune-book has been issued. Labor-Church tracts have also been published, and many thousands of handbills explaining our aims and principles. In July, 1892, a Labor Church was opened at Bradford, and others soon followed. In every case the demand for a church has been entirely local and spontaneous. In July, 1893, the first Conference of Labor-Church delegates was held in Manchester, a Labor-Church Union was formed, a constitution adopted, and a council appointed to carry forward the work of the movement. Fred Brocklehurst, who had formerly assisted me in the work, was appointed general secretary to the Union. Mr. Brocklehurst had studied at Cambridge with a view to entering the Church of England,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but immediately upon taking his academic degree he threw himself wholly into the Labor-Church movement.

At the time of this Conference fourteen Labor Churches had been formed, of which ten were represented. Four were too poor to send delegates. The formation of a Union so early in our career was made necessary by the break-down of my health, and the development of questions which could be dealt with satisfactorily only by the churches collectively. After renewed efforts to return to public life, I have been compelled finally to abandon the attempt, and to confine myself almost entirely to writing, and to the development of such work as can be carried on through the medium of the "Labor Prophet." In this work I have the able assistance of Mr. H. C. Rowe, who is corresponding secretary to the Labor-Church Union.

There are now nominally twenty-four Labor Churches in existence, reaching from Dundee in the North to Plymouth in the South, and we hear of several towns in which Labor-Church services are about to be inaugurated. Only in a dozen towns are there fully organized churches with an enrolled membership. In other cases the church is little more than a Sunday meeting of the Labor Party, usually with the prayer omitted. In most towns the Labor Movement is too poor, both in men and money, to maintain two separate organizations. Indeed, in every direction, the financial difficulty is always with us. At the same time, although my own work depends upon outside sympathizers for support, the churches themselves are self-supporting, and the life of most of them is very vigorous. In Manchester, Bradford, Halifax, Leeds, and some other towns, the Labor Church has a vitality to which all things are possible.

In connection with several of the churches adult classes are held, libraries have been formed, and very poor children are fed and entertained in the winter and taken into the country in the summer. The publication of the hymn-book and the tune-book has enabled them to develop very hearty and characteristic singing. Solos, glees and anthems often form part of the service. Social gatherings are frequently held on Saturday evenings in winter. At the present moment we are going forward with the formation of Sunday schools.

The influence of the Labor Church upon individual life and upon the Labor Movement has undoubtedly been very great and very beneficial—far more so than a stranger casually attending a Labor-Church service would conceive to be possible. Shut out as I now am from personal contact with the whole movement, I am apt to become unduly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

critical of its weaknesses; but I am repeatedly assured by friends, who know what they are talking about, that the church is doing a great work, and that my own estimate of its efficiency is unduly modest.

From the point of view of my own high ideal, the Labor Church is an organized opportunity for the promotion of a real living religion, which we have not yet the speakers to take advantage of. For the most part our speakers are politicians first and foremost. What we are now waiting for is the development of a few prophets, in whose hearts God lives and moves, and on whose lips the Living Fire has been placed. To create a conscious demand for this type of man, and to help toward his development, is now the fixed aim of all my work.

In the Labor Church the basis is being laid for a great religious revival. The very fact of its existence is a perpetual call to a higher life. Meanwhile it has provided a platform and an organization for the development of the Labor Movement at its best, and this opportunity is by no means being wasted. Beyond this I have good reason to know that my own line of work is touching many a heart, and that life and God are being made real to those who had lost their way. It is in these individual souls that the future of the movement lives.

Moreover, the Labor Church has taken root in America, and under circumstances that justify the greatest hopes. Early in the present year, Mr. Herbert N. Casson commenced Labor Church services in Lynn, Mass. He has since been joined by his brother, Mr. Charles W. Casson, who is organizing a church at Providence, R. I. These two young men, the latter of whom visited me recently, are of the true apostolic type. Both have come from the Methodist ministry, and have thrown off their orthodoxy without losing their religious enthusiasm and faith. This latest development justifies the conviction which I had at the first, that if the Labor Church had anything real in it, it would become in time an international church.

The Labor Church, as I conceive it, is an institution which I shall not live to see in its full development, but of its future I have no fear. Though necessarily identifying itself with a passing stage of God's work in the world and of man's activity, beneath its temporary force lies a conception which will apply in varying shape to all times alike, and with an ever-deepening significance as the ages pass. When the Labor Church is no longer needed, because the Labor Movement has fulfilled its mission, the conception underlying it will take on higher forms in the better age which it has helped to bring.

JOHN TREVOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TO ANCIENT GREEK THROUGH MODERN? NO!

It is difficult not to sympathize with the feeling of an educated Greek who sees the language of his forefathers laboriously and ineffectually taught by aliens whose pronunciation falls upon his ears as a strange and barbarous dissonance. One readily comprehends, too, the naïf enthusiasm of the elderly traveller whose own Greek is oxidized an inch thick, and who is awe-struck to find children and cabmen familiarly speaking what he innocently fancies is the mysterious idiom which he failed to master by years of painful drill.

These respectable feelings of the English traveller in Greece and of the Greek traveller in England or America have frequently found expression during the last few years in appeals to the educational public to adopt the modern pronunciation and the teaching of Greek as a living language by natives of Greece. The national susceptibilities involved and the genuine enthusiasm for the best things of the mind that pervade these pleas make it an ungrateful task to combat them, especially when they are so temperate in spirit and dignified in form as the paper on teaching Greek as a living language in the October number of The Forum. But the uncontradicted propagation of erroneous opinion in matters of education is never safe in a country governed in the last resort by public opinion. If the teachers of Greek remain silent, there is danger that the zeal of some sudden convert among our trustees or college presidents may insist on introducing disorganizing experiments into the already sufficiently confused Greek departments of our schools and colleges. It is fitting, then, that some one who is familiar with both sides of the question should make a plain statement of the facts as to the relation between ancient and modern Greek and the educational value of the latter.

And first let me dispose of an *argumentum ad hominem* with which the discussion of the question is frequently embarrassed. It is claimed that the opposition to the reform is due to the habits and interests of the teachers of Greek who are unacquainted with the modern pronunciation and are committed to a mistaken tradition.

But the fact is that a respectable and increasing number of Ameri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can professors of Greek have studied at Athens and reject the so-called reform, if they do reject it, *en connaissance de cause*. At one time I spoke modern Greek, and am still able to follow a lecture in that language, and my unwillingness to see the modern pronunciation introduced into our class-rooms is due simply to the conviction that it is unscientific and displeasing to the ear, and that the association of the study of classical Greek with the modern form of the language offers no compensating gain for these disadvantages.

The matter of pronunciation is really of comparatively slight moment, though it is always put in the forefront of this debate and cannot therefore be passed over in silence. The philological question need not be examined here. It is admitted that we do not know exactly how Sophocles or Demosthenes pronounced. And there is some room for difference of opinion as to the precise dates at which the vowel-sounds characteristic of the modern pronunciation came in. But there is substantial agreement among philologists that the pronunciation described in the introduction to Professor Goodwin's Greek grammar is far nearer the utterance of the ancients than that heard at Athens to-day. The assertion that this pronunciation is more agreeable to the ear will probably be thought a mere subjective prejudice of habit. I have heard lectures on the Greek tragedians at the University of Athens, and have associated freely with students of philology there. In no single instance did I find a modern Greek student who had any appreciation of the verbal melody of Greek poetry, or who was able to read Pindar and Æschylus metrically. And it can hardly be denied that the monotony of the modern Greek vowel-system would sadly impair, if it did not utterly destroy, the music of the vowelled undersong of fluent Greek. Pronunciation, however, as I have said, is a minor matter. If modern Greek is of really great intrinsic educational value, or a considerable aid in the acquisition of the older language, we should probably consent to suppress our prejudices and to reconcile our ears to the sacrifice of something of the rich vowel harmonies of Homer, Pindar, and Æschylus. The value of modern Greek, then, is the real issue.

The continuity and persistent vitality of the Greek language through a period of twenty-eight recorded centuries is an imposing historical phenomenon, and has called forth eloquent utterances from Gibbon, Mrs. Browning, Professors Jebb, Blackie, and Freeman, and from many others who have been or might be quoted in this controversy. To the mature student of universal history it is an inspiring

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and significant fact. What a fascination one felt in reading one's first Greek newspaper at Athens and noting that perhaps five-sixths of the words as they stood on the printed page in accent and spelling were possible ancient Greek! But the guardians of higher education are obliged to make distinctions and reservations that would be discourteous in the passing tourist and are perhaps pedantic in the magazine writer. And the essence of the distinctions relevant here is that we do not require our youth to study Greek because it is "a living language spoken all through the Levant, possessing a contemporaneous and daily increasing literature and an ably conducted newspaper press." There is no lack of languages possessing an ably conducted newspaper press and spoken over wide empires, which it is convenient for tourists and commercial gentlemen to know, but which we cannot study in the few brief years allotted to disinterested culture. If we select Greek rather than Russian or Japanese, it is because it is the noblest language that ever lived on the lips of men and the vehicle of the most original, stimulating, and artistically perfect literature of which history holds record.

Now the language and literature of modern Greece, however estimable the place they hold among the minor languages of southeastern Europe, have nothing of this distinctive nobility and beauty, and their study tends only to confuse the student's perception of these supreme qualities in the ancient tongue. The resemblance of modern to ancient Greek has been much exaggerated. It lies wholly on the surface. And the statement that the difference is far less than that between Chaucerian and modern English, while partially true to the letter, is wholly misleading in spirit. Indeed, there are two modern Greek languages: the rude dialect of the people, which is too remote from ancient Greek to be of any service, and the conventional language of the newspaper and public school, which is an artificial restoration, very convenient for practical purposes, but anathema to the philologist and an abomination to the man of delicate literary sense. Plato could not read a paragraph of a modern Athenian newspaper. If the professor of ancient Greek is able to read the modern Greek newspaper at sight, it is because he translates English, German, and French idioms into Greek vocables of the insipid dialect of the post-classical age as he reads. For the delicate and precise mechanism of the ancient syntax is substituted a clumsy, imperfectly developed, analytic structure; the pure native classical idiom is replaced by a grotesque mixture of all the idioms and worn-out news-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paper metaphors of Europe; and the meanings of all higher spiritual words are confused by associations with the translator's equivalents in French or German: κόσμος, for example,—shades of Pythagoras! —meaning *peuple*, or company, by contamination with the French *monde*. To fix the associations of this hybrid jargon in the mind of the young student is to bar access forever to the perfect purity and propriety of the older tongue.

And for what educational end is this injury to be inflicted? To facilitate the acquisition of a few vocables which with proper training the student can learn easily enough in the class-room. For this and this only it is that lends plausibility to the contention that Greek should be taught as a living language by natives of Greece. The claims put forward for modern Greek in its own name are urged only *pro forma*, or are due to an amiable but undiscriminating patriotism. The number of those who really need to speak modern Greek or find occasion to read a modern Greek book is insignificant. All educated Greeks speak French or English. But it is felt that practically effective command of Greek is not obtained by the systems of teaching now in vogue, and it is vaguely hoped that, approached by the familiar methods employed in the study of modern languages, the college Fetich would lose some of its terrors.

Professor Blackie is quoted as saying that by these methods more of the language can be learned in five months than is now acquired by the assiduous labor of many years. Of course, this could be even approximately true only if knowledge of the language was measured solely by fluent command of the few hundred words employed in the simplest conversation. Absurdly exaggerated as the statement is, however, it contains a challenge that must be answered. And the answer involves the explanation of some misconceptions that attach to the study of Latin as well as Greek. Something of the charges must be frankly admitted. There is much inefficient teaching of this as of other subjects, and much wasteful pre-occupation with abstract grammatical futilities usurping the place of direct study of the concrete facts of the language. But in abatement of this we must remember that our students of Latin and Greek are not mature men. They are boys, learning to use their minds, and their positive achievement is at first necessarily slight in any study that demands more than simple memory. The more rapid progress that sometimes seems to be effected by the employment of so-called natural methods must be attributed to the longer hours demanded by these methods, or to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

limitation of the study to the simpler aspects of the subject, or in some cases to the contagious enthusiasm of the teachers.

There is much exaggeration as well as misconception in the charge that the faithful labor of years fails to give the American student the power of reading ordinary Greek and Latin. The young Greeks themselves, it appears, require six or seven years of training in order to read intelligently authors like Sophocles and Thucydides, and my recollection is that the men at the University of Athens did not interpret Æschylus any better than some college juniors whom I have known. Where the results of eight or nine years of study prove nugatory, it will be generally found on inquiry that the study had not been continuous, or that the student's interest in the substance and thought of the authors read has not been properly aroused. The importance of this last point can hardly be over-estimated. Any bright boy can learn to read ordinary narrative Greek and Latin—fables, Cæsar, or Xenophon—as readily as he learns to read German. If he fails, it is because amid the tempting solicitations of the various studies on the modern side he is not properly stimulated to make the effort. But a large part of classical Greek and Latin literature is not ordinary narrative. It is the loftiest epic, lyric, or drama, the most impassioned and thoughtful oratory, the subtlest philosophy. It is literature of a type that students who prattle very prettily boarding-school French or German, and read light comedies or novelettes, would not think of attempting in French or German, or even in English, for that matter. And the problem of the Greek teacher is first to teach the boy rapidly to read easy prose like Xenophon,—which is, after all, no great trick, if the student can be induced to try; and secondly, to lead him gradually to the intelligent enjoyment of the higher forms of literature with their involved and subtle modes of expression. It is here that the real difficulty and the real educational rewards are found. And to this end natural methods, conversational exercises and modern Greek contribute nothing. They at the best would somewhat shorten the process of gaining familiarity with the commoner words and idioms that occur in the simplest narrative prose.

The advocates of modern Greek, like the advocates of natural methods, begin by loudly proclaiming incontrovertible facts which unfortunately have no relevancy to their particular demands. They rightly insist that in the study of language the ear must be trained as well as the eye, but they are oblivious to the fact that the student's ear may be accustomed to the sound of Greek as well by reading the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Anabasis aloud and hearing his teacher quote Homer, as by chattering guide-book phrases about the weather in modern Greek. They urge that the language should be made of living interest to the student, but they fail to see that the real life of Greek is in the masterpieces of the literature, and that it is through the intelligent interpretation of these that the student's dormant enthusiasm must be awakened. Vigorous teaching of conversational trivialities in modern Greek is perhaps better than inert and mummified teaching of Sophocles. But the power to read and appreciate Sophocles is what we want, and there is really no serious reason why we should not have it.

The obstacles to the ready reading of Greek, assuming the indispensable drill in the elements, are mainly two: lack of vocabulary, and insensibility to the complicated evolution of the thought and the subtle forms of expression that characterize much of the world's higher artistic literature in all languages. The first difficulty can be overcome by any intelligent student who reads faithfully under good guidance for two or three years. The few hundred words that on the most favorable assumption would be used in conversational exercises are insignificant in comparison with the far larger number that must in the nature of things be learned in a purely literary way. A conscious effort to master the vocabulary by frequent reviews, judicious etymologizing, reading aloud, apt citation of parallel passages, and other devices that will suggest themselves to the practised teacher is all that is needed. The other difficulty can be met, in the case of young and immature students, only by gradually initiating them into the appreciation of the elaboration of the expression and the imaginative coloring of the thought that mark high poetic and reflective literature. And this education, one of the best fruits of classical culture, is just what is evaded or postponed by natural methods or by the substitution of the analytic and trivial modern Greek for its nobler ancestor. The student fails—when he fails—from want of appreciation of delicate literary art, or inability to apprehend the peculiar and subtle logic of the higher rhetoric of poetic expression. I have not infrequently known a young student who missed the meaning of a passage of Æschylus or Pindar which he has construed with literal accuracy, to receive immediate illumination from a pertinent parallel from Milton or Shelley. But instead of patiently initiating the student into this difficult and noble *lingua franca* of genius by faithful and sympathetic teaching, we are asked to substitute for it a courier's parrot-like familiarity with a commonplace modern newspaper dialect.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is indeed a sense in which Greek should be taught as a living language—a sense indicated in the words of Lowell, which are irrelevant to Mr. Gennadius's contention, though relevant to mine:

> "If the classic languages are dead, they yet speak to us with a clearer voice than any living tongue. If their language is dead, yet the literature it enshrines is crammed with life as perhaps no other writing, except Shakespeare's, ever was or will be."

It is of this life that the Greek teacher should make himself the interpreter, rather than waste his limited opportunity on the futile endeavor to galvanize a few commonplace phrases of the language into a jerky conversational resurrection. And this the English teacher of Greek can best do by interpreting his authors in their relation to our own national tradition of culture and our own rich poetic inheritance. Greek literature touches our modern life in two chief ways: first, through its universal liberating human quality, whereby it has always appealed to ages of awakened spiritual life like the Renaissance and our own; and secondly, through the historic influence that it has exercised on the finest English poetry and the profoundest English ethical and philosophic thought. In these facts the teacher who has himself entered into the glorious literary heritage that is the birthright of every Englishman will find the suggestions of a natural method of making Greek a living tongue in the only sense possible or desirable for American students.

PAUL SHOREY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MOTHERHOOD AND CITIZENSHIP: WOMAN'S WISEST POLICY.

"MEN are not wise enough, nor generous enough, nor pure enough to legislate fairly for women. The laws of the most civilized nation depress and degrade women."

In the heat of the debate on the subject of woman suffrage, these words of George William Curtis were flung broadcast in the campaign documents. Now that the debate has been silenced, for the time, they are used less aggressively, perhaps, but fully as persistently, by those who feel that they are suffering from the injustice of denial of a legitimate claim; even if not used, they are harbored in the thought of the disappointed woman suffragist as a conclusion proved by the issue of the New York Constitutional Convention.

Alas! that women do not realize that by this arraignment of men they condemn themselves. Is their vision too limited to discern that the more proofs they bring forward of the folly, selfishness, and impurity of men, the more conclusively they are proving, at the same time, that women are not wise enough, as yet, to legislate for themselves?

Every man who legislates has been conceived of woman, has been influenced by her life, her thoughts, her spirit, during his pre-natal existence; has had her impress on his dawning soul; has been led and guided through the first unfolding of his life by her hand; has had his susceptible young heart first in her keeping, his awakening thought first beneath her sway. And if, at last, he grows up to make laws which depress and degrade her, there must be some lack of grace or wisdom, some error of nature or of life in woman, which had better be met and overcome as the first step toward her emancipation; that when it comes it may stand upon a firm foundation, upon the impregnable rock of her own fitness and character.

Evolution is better than revolution; and if the women who lavished their enthusiasm and their activity to secure the right of suffrage be wise, they will now turn their splendid energies into the channel of their opportunity. They will so educate the sons of the present

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

generation that the suffrage, if desirable, will be granted to their daughters as a logical and natural sequence, without the counterbalancing evils, and without the opposing obstacles, that would retard and imperil the use and potentiality of their new privilege, antagonized by the men whom they have fought, and unaided by the men whom they have not convinced.

Warfare and aggression are unlovely methods, and by them women sacrifice much that they can ill afford to lose; whereas, if they are wise, they will wait the opening of the door. A greater gain, long coming, is worth a partial good at hand. There is a surer way, a better road than by suffrage toward the obtaining of her rights, and to her more complete emancipation. It may take more courage, it may require more patience, but by these qualities she justifies her claim.

The discussion that echoed through the land a few months ago failed to touch the vital point. Between the suggested alternatives, —viz., an unsexed woman on the one hand, and a slave of man, or frivolous coquette, on the other,—it lost the reality of woman's mission and high destiny, which she herself has helped to minimize. Much of the complaint that is poured forth as argument for woman's enfranchisement is a tacit admission on her part of inappreciation of her own present opportunities.

Protests from woman that she has little scope because she is not man; that, debarred from coöperation with him, she is confined to patchwork and cooking; that her sphere is limited, narrow, and circumscribed because it has not his larger interests, is as if the mighty element of water should struggle with fate because it was not air. Let it remember that it is a part of the force and power of the universe, different from air, but no less potent. To woman is given the mission of maternity, the basic fact of mortal life: not the mere bearing of children in an accidental, incidental way, but the mission of the perpetuation of the race; the direction and shaping of the race; and, until she understands and studies to fulfil her trust to the utmost, she has failed in her obligation and privilege.

As long as men are unjust to women, carelessly selfish, and cruel, as they too often are, woman is sending forth proofs to the world of her own incapacity and failure. And she has no right to ask,—nay, by her revealed lack of a sense of justice, she forfeits her right to ask,—to be made ruler over more things, until she has been faithful to those already committed to her charge.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Many women have asked with scorn, "Is the whole duty of woman that of child-bearing?" Some women have even been heard to ask, "How much better am I, then, than an animal?" Little better if she can ask this question. The physical burden laid upon woman in the economy of nature must be a factor in the argument that woman's mission is distinct and separate from that of man; for it hampers women with limitations, which increase with the delicacy and fineness of their organisms, setting them in a measure apart; but it is only a detail of the larger function of maternity. The full, wide, spiritual mission of motherhood is the dignity and the opportunity of the sex.

Could any power be greater than that which God and nature have given woman of ploughing the ground, and sowing the seed in her son's heart? Could any representation be more to her advantage than the impress of her own personality which she may leave upon him, if she has turned all the forces of her mind into an intelligent effort to make that impress deep and lasting?

If the argument be advanced that a large proportion of the race is unmarried, and childless, and that, therefore, for them there is no such opportunity, the answer is self-evident,—every man who lives has been born of a woman; and if each mother did her share toward making her son reverent and just enough to legislate more fairly for the sex, and toward giving him a consciousness of her ability and capacity, so that in the end he would gladly grant whatever she might logically claim, the result would be the same for the childless woman. She, therefore, may energize her more fortunate sister for her task, and that will be *her* opportunity.

How do women fulfil the mission of their lives, which—be it welcome or unwelcome,—has been divinely ordered? By a false and foolish sophistry, and a shallow prudery, it is something too often approached in ignorance, concealed and veiled as they draw near to it:—this mighty mystery which is the portal for the race. The whole education of women is often a tissue of half-truths, "ever the blackest of lies." Girls trained by mothers for wifehood are kept in ignorance of the real design of their lives. The preparation for marriage is an equipment, greater or less, for all things worldly and unworldly; but instruction or mention that marriage "was ordained for the procreation of children" has seldom been given. If the young woman has not been too busy with the bridal garments, and the preparation for the feast, she may have read the old and solemn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form of the Holy Ordinance, and wondered vaguely what these words meant; or she may have an embarrassing secret knowledge—gathered from unwise sources—of the wonderful economy of nature; and is half ashamed of knowing what she should have investigated with more zeal, and with as pure intent as she had studied the flowers, or followed the courses of the stars.

That this miscalled innocence pleases the new husband, and is to him an evidence of purity, is but a proof, moreover, that his mother has failed to teach him true standards of estimate. Purity is not negative, but positive—as all moral force must be. Ignorant, she bears her child; uninformed, and often unthinkingly, she rears him, as an "aside" to some active motive in her life of fame, fashion, or religion. Even if her every motive be absorbed in him, and she be a devoted mother, the pattern of domesticity, in her very excess of virtue she often loses the higher conception of a broader righteousness in her work; she may coddle and fondle and pray over her child faithfully and devoutly, may neglect no care of his physical well-being, and yet be all-unmindful of the far-reaching issues she has in her keeping; and, in the moulding of the plastic stuff she has in her hand, be indifferent to the bents and imprints that are to militate against her in the future. Nay, she even encourages and deepens them. Be she a servant of the world, her ambitions for his worldly advancement and for his social prestige will make her tolerate and encourage in its incipiency that which she will deplore in its growth. This is a failure of her moral obligation. But she has failed, as fully, in her intellectual obligation, if she has not made herself the utmost that she may become in all ways; and if she has not instructed him—first thoroughly understanding herself—concerning the full sanctity, dignity, power, and place of woman. "My boy must sow his wild oats, all boys do," sounds shocking to the thoughtful matron, when it comes, as it so often does, from the lips of women who draw young men in their train to facilitate the process; but the "My son knows best, I am only an ignorant woman," is an equal failure in another direction.

It is not enough for woman to be good. The sole obligation of woman in her equipment for her mission is not goodness. She has a mind as well as a soul; and a woman has no more right to let her intellect revel inconsequently, or lapse into lazy lethargy, than she has to let her morals. That, as a rule, she has failed somewhere

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the circle of her duties, her own estimate of, and claim against, men plainly show.

And while so many *are* failing in their obligations, either morally or intellectually, it would seem that there could be but little gain, and much risk, for woman if she succeeds in obtaining the suffrage. The women who are expected to be stimulated by a granted franchise to a more active knowledge of the political life about them, and to a wider interest in deeper subjects than their feminity has hitherto permitted, would sadly disappoint those who are earnest in their prophecy that they would be so stimulated. The woman who has not, without the franchise, kept herself informed that she may instruct her son, that she may meet her husband's mind, that she may throw her influence with her friends into the scale for righteousness, would not be apt to be awakened from her indifference by an added duty. To vote may, or may not, be a right or duty of woman, but it cannot be a remedy for all the evils she urges as her reasons for demanding it. Woman may be equal, may be superior to man, but she must prove her superiority in the duties she is obligated to perform, before she is ready to assume new ones.

Until woman gains truer wisdom than she now shows in her shaping of man, and develops greater strength than she now has in her holding of man, she is weakening the power of her accomplishment, and the probability of her success, in desiring functions and activities that have, heretofore, been confined exclusively to men. This is by no means a lack of appreciation of woman as she is; rather the highest appreciation; the life of the average woman, bearing and rearing children, organizing and conducting households and charitable institutions, flashing and scintillating in the social sphere, sharing and solving petty problems and graver questions that are poured into her ear, all at the same time,—proves that she has both strength and wisdom in a degree not often realized.

But the measure of possession is the measure of obligation; and, having these powers, she should be even more potential and influential than she is, in many ways. Especially the women of the United States, whose social growth has been as free as the spirit of the land; who have drawn, through heredity and intercourse, the varying forces of the differing types,—the vivacity of the French, the domesticity of the German, the romance of the sensuous South, and the balance and practical ability of the English.

How measureless the good to all mankind if the aroused interest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and efforts of women could now be turned toward obtaining emancipation in a broader, truer way; toward a more intellectual apprehension of their own possibilities and present far-reaching opportunities; toward a more intelligent bearing and rearing of sons; toward the training of girls to be more thoughtful and intelligent mothers. Let discussions and exhaustive study on marriage and maternity be begun; let organized investigation be started for finding, and the electrified energies of women be turned toward considering, how they may better shape the work of their own hands. Let them keep before themselves, if they will, the determination to obtain the most complete enfranchisement in the future; but let them remember that to have had a path opened up the mountain-side before starting to climb is a surer and, in the end, quicker way of reaching the summit.

And above all let the ideal of true womanhood be held high before the world's daughters. Woman must compass in herself a trinity: physical well-being, because she is the mother of the race; mental well-being, because she has its youth to teach; spiritual well-being, because to her keeping have been given souls to save.

The complete woman understands to inspire, reaches to love, stoops to heal. Radiant, she goes forth and bathes the world "in smiles of glee;" tenderly she holds close the little child, sheltering its head upon her breast and singing lullabies, crooning soft songs, as though there were no other life but this. When new need arises, some vexed, grave question, some serious problem to be solved —on a sudden this brilliant creature, this careful mother, is the clear-brained, earnest thinker, who brings her faculties of delicate discernment and swift-winged intuition to share and lift the load of him she loves. She weighs, considers, comprehends the intricacies, the financial difficulties that fence him in, the subtleties of the political ambitions that lead him on. Nor is she, for this power of mental grasp, the less a clinging, passionately complete woman when the hour comes for soul to speak. Ah, no! She loves the better that she *is* the more; for highest force comes but from highest powers.

Beneath all the phases of the life she lives,—when she adorns the feasts, when she lights the home, when she shares the conflict of the market-place and the public arena by her sympathy—she glows with the light that has its issues within, that glorifies the commonplace and illumines the every-dayness of life.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The woman who is really earnest, unselfish and single-minded will be willing to wait,—confident in the justice and truth of her own convictions,—and to utilize the present quickening of minds for a process of regeneration as the prelude to a real emanicipation. And the woman who is self-seeking and dissatisfied, who says,—and too many have been heard to say it—"My lot is bondage to man; for woman is but little worth," may have eyes, but she sees not the possibilities of her own high destiny.

KATRINA TRASK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NEW AID TO POPULAR EDUCATION: FREE TRAVELLING LIBRARIES.

THE New York State travelling library system is a direct development of the work of the public library. The local library lends one book, the travelling library lends a hundred; the local library lends to a person, the other to a community; one lends for two weeks, the other for six months. In this way the State library becomes the parent of libraries.

This system was made possible by legislation of the State of New York in 1892. The University law of that year authorized the Regents to lend for a limited time selections of books, from the duplicate department of the State library or from books specially given or bought for this purpose, to public libraries under State supervision, or to communities meeting required conditions. Out of $25,000 appropriated for free libraries, a portion was at once set apart by the Regents to buy and prepare books to be lent under their rules.

The rules then adopted provide that a selection of one hundred books may be lent for six months to the trustees of any public library in the State under Regents' visitation, on payment of a fee of five dollars to cover the expense of cases, catalogues, record-blanks, and transportation both ways. Where no such library exists, the books will be lent on petition of any twenty-five resident taxpayers. In their petition an owner of real estate must be named as trustee, who must be personally responsible for the books. Libraries may be lent to the officers of a university-extension centre, reading course, or study club, if registered by the Regents. A later rule offers selections of fifty volumes for a fee of three dollars.

It was decided to begin with ten libraries of a hundred volumes each. The libraries were chosen with reference to their educational value, without disregarding a reasonable demand for recreation. In these days, fortunately, science is becoming more and more capable of popular illustration, new books of history and travel have the fascination of romance, while fiction is burdened with the most serious problems of humanity; so that in making up a library the task

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of preserving an even balance between information and amusement is by no means so difficult as it would have been twenty-five years ago. Books of reference and periodicals were ruled out, but a few bright sensible books for children were accepted. The tastes of professional men were not ignored; a few significant books on social science or economics were carefully sought. But all these were a small minority. After these, in order of importance, came books about the useful arts, about natural science, books of travel, biography, letters, history, and fiction, which were added in quantity and quality to suit the needs of "the general reader." It was obvious, too, that the requirements of different communities must greatly vary. There are some communities where even the old familiar books would be unknown; in others nothing but the latest would serve. To meet different needs, three libraries of the ten were made to include a liberal allowance of the older favorites, such as Scott, Thackeray, Dickens, Holmes, Prescott, and Parkman, which were excluded from the other seven; and one library was made up wholly of the books of the year 1892.

At length, after much revision and consultation at the State library, one thousand volumes were chosen and distributed into ten groups as nearly equal as possible in the range of subjects, in literary merit, and in attractiveness. The percentage of each kind of literature was: Fiction, 22 per cent; History, 18; Biography, 13; Travel, 11; Science and Useful Arts, 9; Sociology, 5; Religion and Ethics, 4; Fine Arts, 3; other literature, 15.

Since the first ten lists were made up, later books have been constantly bought to supply additional libraries. The later libraries have been of fifty volumes instead of one hundred, to permit the more frequent appearance of a new library and a wider range of choice to the borrower, or the borrowing of a small library at less cost. The choice of books rests with the Book Board, made up of five members of the staff of the New York State Library.

In addition to the general libraries, special-subject lists have been prepared; a set of fifty and a set of twenty-five volumes in each subject. Economics, Agriculture, French History, and United States History have been already taken up in these selections, besides lists in Literature, to cover Regents' reading-courses. The general lists now number eighteen; the special lists, nine. The university-extension libraries also should be noticed. Any registered extension-centre may obtain one hundred dollars' worth of books for reference,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selected by their lecturer, on the same terms as a travelling library. The same privilege is extended also to registered study-clubs and reading-circles. As fast as these books are returned, they are arranged as a distinct library to meet future requisitions.

The first purchase of books consisted of two sets of each of the ten general libraries. As the demand increased, other sets of the same were needed, and several have been duplicated ten times. Cloth-bound editions have been used. The price of single volumes has varied from forty cents to five dollars, list price. The average cost is a little less than one dollar a volume.

Books are made ready for circulation as in a well-equipped public library. The catalogue-note on each book is intended to give in the briefest form a clear idea of its scope and character. Every copy of the printed catalogues contains the rules for local circulation, and these are supplied in quantity with each library sent out. A simple system of charging borrowed books is indicated in the rules, and book-cards and readers' cards, specially designed for the purpose, are supplied. All cards are returned to Albany with the books, enabling the central office to keep full statistics of the use of each volume. An oak bookcase, with neatly panelled doors and a lock and key, is furnished with every fifty books. There is sent also a plain oak cabinet with a single drawer with compartments to hold cards, and the like. This outfit, with cards and packing-cases, costs about fourteen dollars for every hundred volumes.

The first travelling library went out February 8, 1893. In eight months, up to October 1, 1893, 24 libraries had been sent out. In the second year, up to October 1, 1894, 101 had been sent; a total of 125. They went to 86 places. Of these 125, 43 were sent on petition; 40 to public libraries; 22 to academy libraries open to the public; 18 to university-extension centres; 2 to individual borrowers. In all, 11,900 volumes were sent out, of which 9,600 were included in general libraries, 950 in subject libraries, and 1,350 in university-extension libraries. Forty-four of these libraries, aggregating 4,400 volumes, are still out, leaving 7,500 volumes which have been returned without any loss or serious injury. One missing book, costing seventy cents, was paid for by a trustee.

Complete statistics of the circulation of 5,300 volumes are at hand. Their total circulation was 15,358, an average of 290 readers to each 100 volumes, in a period of six months. The smallest circulation was 66, the largest 609. One 50-volume library circu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lated 338. The number of borrowers was 4,392, showing an average of three-and-a-half books to a reader. The details of circulation of the different libraries show great variation.

The library which had a circulation of 609 in one place had 186 in another; that which had 598 in one place had 122 elsewhere. The library that had but 66 in one place had 476 in another, showing that the circulation was determined by local conditions. Let us note a few examples. The library that reached the highest mark of 609 in six months was in the small village of Havana, in Schuyler county, where a library association had been organized by women a few years ago and had four or five hundred well-read books. But their books were growing old, subscribers were few, and they were at the point of discouragement when they petitioned for a travelling library, and made their own library free. The next highest circulation—of 598—was reached in Ogdensburgh, where a newly chartered public library of 3,000 volumes is under the care of the principal of the public schools, who, with his teachers, has guided an enthusiastic group of readers. Three successive libraries have gone to an academy in Canandaigua, and, under like active influences, have reached circulations of 339, 504, and 476. At Peru, a small station on the Au Sable Railroad where books were very scarce, a circulation of 490 was recorded, one reader taking 38. The lowest circulation of 66 was in a place where the demand was cut off by a prosperous library of 5,000 volumes. Nineteen places have already had two successive libraries, five places have had three, Fort Plain has had four, and Plattsburgh five. From this beginning Plattsburgh has now a promising public library just chartered, whose trustees are preparing for use their first purchase of $400 worth of books. Six public libraries chartered within the year began by petitioning for travelling libraries.

Many interesting items might be gleaned from the record of individual books. For example, Mrs. Burnett's "Surly Tim" had fourteen readers in one place, and eleven, nine, three, and two in others, and none at all in another. "That Lass o' Lowrie's" was taken out by seventeen in one town, and fifteen, four, two, six, and twelve in others. "Henry Esmond" was read ten times, and "The Virginians" nine times, in one place, and neither was called for in another. The circulation of fiction was 52 per cent of all; but the books of fiction in the library were only 22 per cent.

In the department of Travel the popular books are: "The West from a Car Window," 18 readers; "Boy Travellers in Africa," 16;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Tramp across the Continent," 15; "On Canada's Frontier," 14; "Tenting on the Plains," 12; "Knockabout Club on the Spanish Main," 12. In Popular Science, only one goes above 11, and that is "Feathers, Furs and Fins," at 16 calls; "Electricity in Daily Life" has 10; "Horse Stories," 11.

Books on Social Science were usually read by two or three persons in a place. The highest records in this class are: "How the Other Half Lives," 8 readers; "Children of the Poor," 6; "Who Pays Your Taxes?" 6; "Girls and Women," 6. In Biography, the favorites are: Butterworth's "Lincoln," 13 readers; Coffin's "Lincoln," 11; Holmes's "Ralph Waldo Emerson," 11; Hale's "New England Boyhood," 11; Schurz's "Lincoln," 10. Plainly, Lincoln is the hero. In other literature, "Over the Tea-Cups" had 15 readers; "A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court," 13; "My Summer in a Garden," 10. In History the war stories are in the ascendant. Page's "Among the Camps" had 17 readers; "Boys of '61," 13; "Blue-Jackets of '76," 11; "Battlefields and Victory," 10; "Battlefields of '61," 8.

A list of the neglected books is not without interest; but a large number of trials would be needed for a fair comparison. When Library No. 10 had gone out and returned ten times, there was but one of its books unused in any place. That was Adams's "Three Episodes of Massachusetts History." This would not have occurred in ten Massachusetts towns. In the same library Merry's "Select Fragments of Roman Poetry," a book in Latin, had a reading in three different places. Keene's "Literature of France" was read in only one place, but by two readers. The number of neglected books is always reduced by further returns.

There is little to choose between the libraries in regard to popularity. The most popular has been the library which consists wholly of books published in 1892. But if the library that stands at the foot of the list in popularity had gone to the same places as the other libraries, I have no doubt it would have stood as high.

If, now, we turn to see how many books were taken by a single reader in six months, we find in one place,—Peru,—38 books charged to one name. At Harkness, the next station to Peru, a girl of thirteen took 32 books, and a neighbor's boy of fifteen took 25. Other places show readers who handled 31, 27, and 24 books each. We cannot be sure that they read them, but it indicates at least the insatiable book-hunger that prevails in some localities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a general indication of the appreciation with which the travelling libraries have been regarded by those who have used them, a few expressions are quoted from letters received:

"There was a great deal of interest in our last library, and I believe, when we get another, nearly all the books will be out at once."

"This is a country school district. Some of our people have never read books of any kind, and few have had the opportunity to read books like these."

"Interest is increasing. . . . Circulation has a steady growth."

"The circulation has greatly increased."

"We shall certainly get another next winter and every winter."

"The number of readers of our local library has increased tenfold."

"Increased interest in every direction. . . . It has led to the establishment of a reading-room."

We may say that 25,000 books have been read as a result of these travelling libraries. They have been good books and have left their mark on a multitude of minds. These libraries have everywhere promoted an interest in good reading, and have already led to the establishment of some important local libraries. They have been cordially received and are more in demand now than ever before. As a public investment they have fully vindicated the wisdom of their projectors and have proved worthy of the continued interest of the State. The system admits, too, of indefinite enlargement. Special-subject libraries may be multiplied as fast as they are wanted; and the addition of general libraries can keep pace with the publication of good books. The State of New York can well afford this offer of books to her citizens, which is at once generous and, in the highest sense, profitable; and the plan is confidently commended to the consideration of other States.

WILLIAM R. EASTMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROPER TRAINING AND THE FUTURE OF THE INDIANS.

LATE in the forties a party of Winnebago Indians camped on Honeyoy creek in Walworth County, Wisconsin. They were on their way to Chicago to meet the authorities of the Federal Government. As they arrived at the ground the few weary horses were burdened with packs; old men and women were foot-sore and disconsolate; mothers with children on their backs sank down to rest as they reached the brink of the creek; and tired children toddled into camp and sank to sleep. A few of the more vigorous men and women prepared a scanty evening meal. Some days later the same Indians returned, but their condition was very greatly improved. The women were dressed in calicoes, the men in blankets, even the children had shoes, and a spirit of happiness prevailed. From a hill which was covered with a burr-oak grove a great spring gurgled and its rill ran through a meadow into the creek. In a glade near the spring the Indians established their canvas town of tents arranged in a circle. In the centre they placed the camp-fire. It was historic ground to them: the spring was a fountain at which their forefathers had quaffed, the groves about were the hunting-grounds of their ancestors, and in the creek their fathers had caught fish. On this sacred spot the tribe lingered for more than a week, hunting and fishing by day, dancing and feasting by night.

This temporary Indian village was on my father's farm, not a mile away from our new house. My mother and elder sisters visited the camp, taking me with them, and I gradually learned that the new wealth with which they seemed so glad was a part of the price of the ancient tribal homestead, and that the right to our new home was acquired through the Government from these self-same Indians. The little creek, now obstructed by a mill dam, was once beset with fish snares, and the strip of ground on which we had planted our apple orchard had been their rabbit preserve. I can yet remember how deeply these facts were impressed on my mind, as my mother gathered them from two or three Indians who could speak English.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This was my introduction to the Indians of the United States. Since that time I have lived among them and travelled much in their country, so that nearly one-half of my time has been passed with these people. I have seen most of the tribes of the United States. I have wandered with them in the woods, ridden with them across the plains, climbed with them over mountains, visited their homes, slept in their camps, and studied their languages, habits, customs, and mythology. For twenty-five years I have had associated with me on exploring expeditions and in the work of the Bureau of Ethnology a number of men who, like myself, have been making a life-study of the North American Indians. These investigations have extended from the Eskimo of the Arctic circle to the Maya of the tropics. As the result of these researches we have published about fifty volumes of reports of all kinds. Of course, therefore, my interest in the "Indian problem" is profound.

The most pertinent and interesting aspect of the subject now is that with reference to the efforts that have been made to educate the Indians. These experiments have now been going on a sufficiently long time to enable us to reach something like a clear conclusion as to whether any considerable proportion of the North American Indians may ever be expected to merge themselves into our American life as civilized men, or whether these agencies for educating and civilizing them will at most do only a good service to a few individuals—an inconsiderable number of the whole—and the great mass of Indians will be left gradually to disappear as civilization presses in around them in an ever-narrowing circle; and I am asked to give my judgment on this matter.

At first I began to collate the statistics of Indian education, and I prepared a number of tables to show the progress made in schools—under such headings as "The growth of Indian schools from decade to decade," "Money expended in the establishment of schools," "Money expended in the maintenance of schools," "Attendance from year to year." I then began a statistical article and attempted to draw some lessons from it. Then I found myself in a confused state of mind. The statistics seemed hardly to be related to the transformation which I had observed in the Indian tribes during the last forty-five years. There are some things that cannot be numbered. I have seen scores of thousands of Indians pass from the state of savagery to a half-civilized condition, and a smaller number into practical civilization. Under my own eye thousands of them, naked the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greater part of the time, but gaudily dressed in fantastic pelts, furs, and feathers on gala days, have thrown aside these gauds and adopted the costume of civilized man. Men by the thousands who were snaring rabbits in their youth and my youth are now guiding the plough; girls who were picking berries then are now churning butter. Boys and girls who were speaking in languages native to only a few hundred persons, are now speaking our common tongue. Medicine-men who were practising sorcery when I was a boy are dead, and in their stead physicians employed by the General Government are administering quinine. Scores of thousands of people subject to the superstitions of sorcery and to the attendant methods of torture by which evil spirits are supposed to be driven out, are now submitting to rational treatment for disease. Few of the old men and women speak our language; usually the children speak it, and in another generation one homogeneous tongue will replace the multiplied jargons of savagery. These facts and many more I could not tell in tables of statistics, so I put my notes in the waste-basket and commenced again. The statistics remain in the reports of the Indian Bureau. I will tell my story without them.

More money has been paid to extinguish Indian titles than to extinguish the titles of foreign nations, and the cost of Indian wars has been greater than the cost of foreign wars. In treating with foreign governments we have employed our ablest statesmen; so in treating with Indian tribes we have always employed men of high character. In looking over the list of the men who have made treaties with the Indian tribes we find such men as Jackson, Harrison, Cass and many others who have served in the councils of the Nation. We have always been liberal in our bargains, giving to the tribes moneys in excess of the values of their lands at the time when they were purchased, and at the same time confirming to them the title of portions of their lands as reservations. As the country was redeemed to civilization these reservations have developed in value by unearned increment, so that many tribes have become comparatively wealthy and nearly all are well-to-do.

This policy of extinguishing Indian titles by purchase has necessarily involved great expense, and as we are rapidly cutting down the reservations the expense is growing from year to year. Sometimes we have purchased directly from the Indians and paid in instalments, and sometimes we have sold Indian lands and held the funds in trust to pay the principal and interest in instalments. The Indian appro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

priation for the current fiscal year, for example, aggregates the sum of $10,750,486.03, made up of the following items:

Expense of supporting Indian agencies and furnishing gratuitous supplies	$1,776,010.84
Fulfilling treaty stipulations	2,936,846.53
Payment of principal and interest of trust funds	1,509,236.66
Purchase of lands	2,467,697.00
Support of schools	2,060,695.00
	$10,750,486.03

From the above it will be seen that the expense of supporting the Indian agencies, together with all gratuities, is less than $2,000,000, while we pay this year nearly $3,000,000 to fulfil treaty stipulations, and $1,500,000 due Indians as trust funds, and for newly purchased lands $2,500,000. Thus, nearly $7,000,000 are paid under treaty obligations, all solemnly promised to the tribes by diplomatic officers of high standing, approved by the President of the United States, and, finally, confirmed by the Senate, as if the treaties had been made with foreign nations.

But more than this: in making these treaties or bargains with the tribes, the negotiating officers have usually represented to the Indians that agencies would be established and that they would be taught the industries of civilization, and that their children would be taught in schools established by the General Government. Sometimes these items are stipulated in a general way in the treaty; but in the history of the treaties it has usually been recorded by the officers making the treaties that such requests were made by the Indian tribes, and that such promises were made as an argument to induce them to part with their lands, so that all the expense now incurred by the General Government is practically a debt due to the Indian tribes in fulfilment of promises made by the Government and its authorized agencies. Whether the policy be wise or unwise it cannot be abandoned; it is fixed upon the country. No Congress can fail to make the appropriation without disgrace; no party can with impunity fail to fulfil the obligation incurred.

What effect is this having on the Indian himself? Will he become a beggar and a vagabond? Does he feel himself a pauper degraded by receiving alms from the white man? On these questions hangs the wisdom or folly of the policy adopted by the Government of the United States in its management of the Indians. All other nations have adopted a different policy in dealing with aboriginal savage peoples. We have treated with them as sovereign nations, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have purchased their lands at comparatively high prices; other nations have treated savages exclusively as wards and paupers, with no rights which the white man was bound to respect. The effect of these two policies on the development of Indian character is great. The Indians to the North and South of us have been comparatively peaceful and have accepted the position assigned them as a degraded and dependent race. The Indians of the United States have carried themselves with pride and defiance, demanding their rights and fighting for them when they must. On the frontiers our Indians have sometimes been abused, but in general they have held their own, and altogether they have received from the Government a justice which, though sometimes tardy, has usually been ample, and more than ample, for this reason: whatever might be the conflict which arose between the white settlers and the red tribe, in every dispute the Indians had for their support the sentiment of the people of the whole United States, which was sure sooner or later to be expressed by the officers of the General Government. It was impossible to grant the Indians all they asked. They desired to be left alone in the quiet possession of their lands. The march of civilization could not thus be checked. Realizing this the people of the United States have encouraged the invading settlers to make new homes and assured them of protection; and in carrying out this policy treaty after treaty has been made with the Indians. Petty wars have arisen from time to time, and as soon as an Indian tribe discovered the hopelessness of such a contest treaty negotiations were begun, they demanding payment for lands, we yielding a price which at the time was ample and often more than ample. So we have paid to Indians, never numbering more than four hundred thousand souls, more than three hundred millions of dollars, and have yet secured to them lands which by increase of value through unearned increment are now worth more than were the lands originally claimed by them. Treated in this manner the Indians have not become mendicants and criminals. They have retained their self-respect; they are proud of their ancestry and glory in the virtues of their race.

Many schools of this country had their beginning in attempts to educate the Indians; even Harvard University was first an Indian school. After the organization of the Federal Government many attempts were made to educate the Indians, some by the Government but many more by individual enterprise. Perhaps some good was done in this way, but in the aggregate the early attempts were dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appointing, as the schools established were not endowed with long life. Why they disappeared so soon after their founding is now made plain, but at the time it was not understood, and failure carried consternation into the minds of many good people. From the first it was not properly known that the Indians were not a homogeneous people. The white man did not know that he was dealing with hundreds of distinct governments, hundreds of distinct religions, and hundreds of distinct languages. That which was accomplished for one little tribe had no further influence by extending beyond its boundary. The distinctions between tribe and tribe were as radical as those existing between any one of the tribes and the invading Europeans. The Scriptures, translated into an Indian tongue after years of missionary toil, could be read by only a few persons. The labor of translating the Bible and the accessory religious books into five hundred or a thousand different languages, and of training missionaries to preach and teach in all these languages, was an undertaking too great even for religious enthusiasm. For such reasons the early methods devised for civilizing the Indian tribes largely failed. Schools failed and books failed. Progress was made to the extent that the Indians came in contact with civilized man and learned his ways and industries, but it was acculturation, not education, by which the advance was secured. The triumphs of civilization, the power of prosperity, the wonders of industrial art, all made a deep impression on the Indian, and from them he learned much, but from the school and books he learned little.

A time came when this was changed. When all the valleys of the United States were settled and all the Indians were assigned to small reservations, when the buffalo were killed, the hunting-fields ploughed, the fishing-grounds navigated, and the Indian absolutely stranded on the shore of civilization where he must live under new conditions or die, the problem was presented to his mind in a new light. Fortunately at this juncture the right men came to the front. Pratt of Carlisle, and Armstrong of Hampton, were men who grasped the new conditions and devised a system of education that has since been accepted and is being rapidly developed, the results of which are potent in directing Indian life into civilized channels. The old education was literary and religious; the new education is industrial.

To learn a trade fifty years ago it was necessary for a boy to serve as an apprentice for seven years, to become a journeyman, and at last a master workman. There were many trades, and no common method

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by which they could be taught by one person to a number of people working together. That day has departed. Machinery does the special work of all trades. This change from hand-work to machine-work constitutes the greatest epoch of human history since the art of making fire was discovered. All skilled work is done by machinery; years of training are no longer required to learn a trade, and if the boss employs men under the plea of apprenticeship they are set to do work which the masters do, and they can do it just as well.

The differentiation of trades has been replaced by the invention of machinery, so that the skilled workman is now the skilled machine. There must yet be a few special workmen, but the great body of mechanics are machine-tenders. In this manner a new and universal trade has been developed. By this transformation labor has become mobile so that it can easily pass from one theatre of operation to another. What is now needed is a general deftness by which a man may turn from one operation to another as the call arises, and this general deftness is the universal trade. This was the Carlisle and Hampton idea, and it is the principle which is at the basis of industrial education first systematically developed in the highest grade through the agency of our polytechnic schools, but now it has found its way into the public schools and is gradually permeating the whole system.

From Carlisle and Hampton the new education has spread through the West so that a number of special institutions have already been established in proximity to the Indian reservations, while others have been founded upon the reservations themselves.

Their influence is already widely manifest, for the young Indians are everywhere drifting into a new industrial life. They are becoming farmers, and learning to use the plough, the cultivator, and the harvester. They are becoming lumbermen, and fell trees, navigate rafts and saw timber; they build houses and manufacture furniture, and in a multitude of ways are learning the universal trade. The young Indians from Hampton and Carlisle, and to a slight extent some of those trained in the later schools, are taking their positions as special laborers in the higher grades. The full fruition of this policy does not yet appear; in fact, the policy is not yet universal. Some schools have not been transformed, others are in progress of transformation: only a few are fully fledged industrial schools. Teachers competent to inaugurate the system have not always been found, but the work has fairly begun and the beneficial effects are already seen.

About 20,000 Indian pupils are now under instruction, some in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good schools, some in fair schools, and some in nearly worthless schools, but all are improving. The system of education adopted extends beyond the school-house. Farmers and other instructors are now employed to teach the Indians the practical arts of life. To a large extent the moneys due to Indians under treaty stipulations are not directly paid in currency, but are expended for them by the Government agent in the improvement of their homes and the purchase of necessary current supplies. If an irrigating canal is to be constructed the Indians are employed to dig it for themselves and paid fair wages for their work, and then they own the canal. Instead of building houses for them the Government pays them by the day's work to build their own houses, and treaty obligations are thus fulfilled. So on all the reservations the Indians are set to work, and by every possible means made to toil for themselves rather than made the beneficiaries of sums of money. Young Sioux that fought Custer now drive teams at the Government agency; Navajo that fought Kit Carson are now digging ditches; and Apaches that fought Crook are now husking corn.

The pioneers of industrial training for the Indians had the wisdom to discover the changed conditions and they said, "We will train boys and girls for the new industrial life." For this purpose many were brought from their reservations to Carlisle and Hampton. The experiment soon proved successful, and now such schools are established on or near the more important reservations. Still the work of enlarging the labor schools is in progress. Now, the Indians are taught to work, and to speak and write the English language and certain rudiments, all of which are well calculated to prepare them for industrial life. Not all the schools are thus transformed, but the metamorphosis is well under way. There are some schools on the old plan, and the national authorities assist many that have been established as denominational enterprises for religious instruction, but the contagion of good example is working, and it will not require many years more to complete the revolution, when the purposes of Indian education will be industry and an understanding of English speech, not sacraments and creeds, and when it will be taught that an honest day's labor is a moral duty. In the meantime the Methodists, the Baptists and the Catholics will develop their schools and teach the Christian religion as it is interpreted by the various sects, and plant a new religion which is a characteristic of the highest civilization.

J. W. POWELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE INCREASING COST OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION.

THE increase in the number of students in American colleges in the last two generations should be still further augmented. The period of education, too, should be lengthened for most boys and girls, men and women. Of the students at any one time enrolled in the public schools of the United States only twelve per cent graduate, and the private academies and seminaries exhibit as low a percentage of graduates as seven. Many college classes show a decrease of one-fifth, and I have known classes to have only one-half as many men upon the Commencement platform as stood together in the Freshman year. We ought to do all that can be done to have the pupils of the grammar-school enter the high-school, cause students of the high-school to complete the course, and urge graduates of the high-school to take degrees at the college.

It is never to be denied that many men and women do not want a college education. It is also to be granted that if a person does not want a college course the college does not want him. He would probably be hurt by the college, and he certainly would hurt the college. And yet most persons would be glad of an education if it could be had. The most evident reason which prevents worthy men who desire a college training from getting it is the cost. Mr. Benjamin Kidd, in his "Social Evolution," says:

> "Even from that large and growing class of positions for which high acquirement or superior education is the only qualification, and of which we, consequently (with strange inaccuracy), speak as if they were open to all comers, it may be perceived that the larger proportions of the people are excluded—almost as rigorously and as absolutely as in any past condition of society—by the simple fact that the ability to acquire such education or qualification is at present the exclusive privilege of wealth."

In one view of the question the cost of a college education is high. The average cost to the student per year at the better college is larger than the total income of the average American family. The cost, too, has greatly increased. I have lying before me tables which indicate the cost of education in certain respects at three such old and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

representative colleges as Harvard, Yale, and Dartmouth since their foundation. I shall begin with the former.

From 1825–30 the average annual expenses of a student at Harvard were $176, of which half went for tuition and half for board and room; from 1831–40 the average was $188.10; from 1840–48, $194; 1849–60, $227 ($138 went for board and room); in the 'sixties it jumped from $263 to $437, two-thirds of which went for board and room; in 1881–82 the average expense to an economical student ranged from $484 to $807, the latter sum including a few more material comforts, and in 1893–94 these last figures had been slightly reduced.

At Yale the increase of expenses was nearly in the same ratio, the average for the opening year (1821) being $175, and the average for 1893 being $687.50.

Eleven catalogues of Dartmouth College which I examined mention no expenses prior to 1822, in which year the cost of tuition was $26, other expenses amounting to about $75. This scale of expense changed little until 1862, when tuition cost $51, and other expenses amounted to about $101. In 1892 the figures were higher, tuition being $90 and other expenses about $191.

At the risk of inflicting too many figures upon the reader I venture to give certain further facts in reference to the increase of bills at a few other colleges. In 1830 the total expenses per student at Waterville, Hamilton, Amherst, Brown, and the University of Pennsylvania ranged from $84 at the first named to $180 at the last; in 1893 from $275, or more, at Waterville to $335, or more, at the University of Pennsylvania. President Lord, of Dartmouth, wrote in 1830:

> "Our students have just now commenced reform with an excellent spirit in regard to their diet. Several boarding-houses have been opened upon the principle of strict temperance, and perhaps fifty or sixty young men have good living for $1 to $1.12½ per week. It may be understood that boarding may now be had in our most respectable families for $1, the student consenting to a moderate, but in all respects sufficient bill of fare, and which will insure the '*mens sana in corpore sano.*'"

These facts necessitate the conclusion that every element of the cost of an education has in the last sixty years increased three or four fold. The following notes taken from the college-books of Harvard show the contrast between the simplicity of its early days and the more costly necessities of the present:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

May 22, 1727.—Tuition charge advanced from ten to fifteen shillings per quarter.
Sept. 8, 1778.—Tuition raised to 40^{s} a quarter.
Dec. 15, 1778.—Assessment as follows: To Hancock Professor 16^{s}: to Tuition £5 5^{s} 0^{d}: to the Monitors 2^{d}: to gallery money 6^{s}. Also, on the Junior and Senior Sophisters, for Library £1 5^{s} 0^{d}; for Hollis Prof. Math. £2. Reckoning is always by the quarter.
(Money is greatly depreciated at this time.) Assessments were levied for various purposes, permanent and occasional; votes on this subject are numerous. This custom makes it impossible to fix the charges satisfactorily for any extended period.
Oct. 14, 1805.—Tuition for Seniors and Juniors $5.50 a quarter; for Sophomores and Freshmen $4.50.
Aug. 7, 1806.—Tuition doubled—twice as much as preceding quarter.
Dec. 16, 1806.—10^{c} assessment on each student attending the French instruction.
Sept. 13, 1811.—Tuition increased one quarter part.
1667.—"The cook, receiving provisions from y^{e} Steward at current prices, shall deliver the same out, to y^{e} scholars, advancing an halfe penny upon a penny." "The Butler, receiving his beer from y^{e} Steward, single beer at 2^{s}, & double beer at 4^{s} y^{e} barrell, shall advance 4^{d} upon y^{e} shilling."
1702.—Steward allowed to ch'ge two pence 3 farthings for each "part."
1724, Apr. 14.—Steward may charge 6 pence per *part* the current quarter.
1732, Nov. 7.—Food increased: Steward may charge 10 pence half penny for a part at noon: other meals remain the same.
1737, Apr. 6.—Provisions dear: so charged 16^{d} a part at noon, 10^{d} at night: bread to be 5^{d} a loaf.
1741, Apr. 15.—Dearness of provisions. Steward to ch'ge 2^{s} a part at dinner, 15^{d} at night.
1748, Oct. 19.—Particular management of Commons, and the price, left to be ordered by the members of the corporation resident in Cambridge.
1750, Aug. 15.—Prices of Commons fixed: Bread—two pence per loaf. Dinner—five pence, one farthing ("of which $\frac{1}{9}$ part is allowed for sauce"). Beer—one penny a quart. Supper—three pence, one farthing.
Commons to be as follows: "Two sizzes of bread in the morning, one pound of Meat at Dinner wth sufficient sauce & half a pint of Beer: & at Night, That a Part Pye, be of the same Quantity as usual, & also half a pint of Beer, and that the Supper Messes be but of four Parts, tho' the dinner Messes . . . be of six."

It cannot be said that this increase of cost can in any way be avoided. It is simply a part of the increase which belongs to the cost of living in a simple and rural community to living in a community whose relations are more or less elaborate. The college is a part of the community; it is moved by all that moves the community. The ordinary family of the community is spending several times as much money as the family of the community of two generations ago. The college-man does as the family does of which he is a member. It is also to be said that the cost of the administration of a college has vastly increased. Though complaints as to the present small salaries of college professors abound, yet these salaries have increased quite as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rapidly as most incomes. At the period of the American Revolution the average salary of a professor at Harvard was £200. Early in the century the salary was $1,500 and remained at that figure till 1838–39. At this time it was increased to $1,800. In 1854 it was raised to $2,000. In the next twelve years it was by successive increments so increased that in 1866 it was $3,200. In 1869 it became $4,000. The maximum salary now paid in the college is $4,500, and in the Law School $5,000.

The most expensive part, in certain respects, of a college to-day is the laboratory and the library. The laboratory is wholly a new creation, and the library in its present extensive relations is also new. The library of Harvard College cost for the year for which the last report is made $50,000. What a laboratory costs it is hard to separate from other elements of expense. But each college is spending in scientific instruction and in scientific apparatus many times what it expended some years ago. All this increase of cost must directly or indirectly increase the cost of an education to each student.

Yet the cost to a student for an education does not consist only of the amount of his formal fees and of the cost of board and room. The expenses which are called incidental are now in a few colleges larger than all others. Not a few college men of an economical turn find that when they have added together the three things,—the cost of tuition, room and board—that the expenditure of the whole year will be represented by this sum multiplied by two. Now there can be no doubt that the cost of an education is keeping many men from receiving it, and the question therefore recurs, Can anything be done to open the way to boys who want to go to college but who cannot pass through the narrow financial doorway?

In answer it is to be said, first, the cost of an education to the student should not be lessened by lessening the cost of administration or of instruction or by diminishing the efficiency of laboratories and libraries. Such a diminution would represent the diminution of the worth of a college course. It would also represent a change which the colleges themselves would not endure. Secondly, a decrease should not be secured through a decrease in the fee for tuition. The fee for tuition now represents only a part of the cost of the tuition itself. President Coulter has recently gathered together certain very suggestive facts upon this point, which are well worth careful study. From his table, which shows, among other interesting things, the cost,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

above fees, to the leading American universities of educating their students, I have selected a dozen of the largest institutions, and I find that the average cost per student over and above fees to these twelve colleges is $245. The figures I used in this computation range from $128 at Vassar to $400 at the Leland Stanford, Jr., University.

But on the positive side it may be said, first, that the cost of an education may be secured through the increase of endowment. This increase of endowment and the consequent increase in income would allow a decrease in the amount which the college receives from the student. Second, the same result might be secured by a tax laid upon the people for the benefit of the college. The State university is the result of a public tax. Should the State lay a tax upon itself for the benefit of more than one college?

In answer to the second of these two questions it is to be said that one university supported by the State is sufficient. Ohio has three universities which are supported in part out of the public chest. Those who are best acquainted with the education of this great State believe that it would be for the advantage of the State and of education if the money now given to three colleges could be given to one. Not a few colleges in each State are denominational, and the chief reason for their existence is the denominational reason. No tax should be assessed for the promotion of such interests.

In respect to the method of decreasing the cost of education through the increase of endowment it is to be said that such increase has seldom resulted in such decrease. For, as a rule, every college has need of all the funds it can possess for filling up urgent needs. But there is a method, the opposite of this, which might result in allowing a poor boy to come to college. It consists in the increase of tuition fees. As has been said, the present fee for tuition represents only a share of the cost of tuition. Why should not the fee be increased to represent the entire cost? Why should there not be a payment in money of the cost value of instruction? Any reason which can be given for paying less than a college education costs is a reason which I apprehend would overthrow most economic theories. The American people have come to expect that the American college shall give an education at less than its cost. This expectation should cease. It has arisen from the free public school system. Every American child goes to the public school without a direct expenditure on the part of the parent. The parent does not feel the indirect taxes which he pays for his child's education. It is hard,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

therefore, for him to pay the fee at the college to which his son or daughter goes upon graduation from the high-school.

It is also to be said that the price of instruction at the college is higher than the price of many secondary or even primary private schools. One hundred and fifty dollars is an extreme price for tuition at the college, but twice one hundred and fifty dollars is an extreme price for tuition at certain private schools. But there are two special reasons for the increase of fees. The one of less force is that not a few rich men are not willing to give their money to afford the sons of other rich men an education at less than its cost. A friend of mine with whom I was recently conversing said to me, "I can give you, if you wish, a large amount of money, but that amount of money would go for the benefit of the son of Mr. A. or Mr. B., who is perfectly able to pay all his son's fees at their full amount." The force of the reasoning cannot be easily set aside, as the truth of the fact cannot be denied. But the special reason for this increase lies in the fact that money would thus be had for the benefit of men who could not pay for a college education. If the American college could increase its tuition fee to $500, there are not a few men in the college who would be willing and able to pay this fee, and who ought to pay this fee, for the fee represents simply what the education costs. With the present endowments and with the increase of endowments sure to be made, these payments would allow each college to offer an education to men who are not able to pay for it, at a very small cost. Thus, every poor boy in America who wants an education could receive it.

CHARLES F. THWING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FINANCIAL YEAR AND THE OUTLOOK.

THE opening of a new year finds the American people still struggling toward better times, but with a clearer prospect ahead than a year ago. That prophecies made soon after the panic, regarding the speedy return of prosperity, were falsified by the events of the year 1894, we know. It was easy to prophesy by drawing discriminating comparisons with the conditions which followed the panic of 1873. That memorable period of liquidation caught the country unawares. It came upon us after a time of high prices: it found the affairs of the great business and banking houses so intertwined that the fall of one was followed as a necessary sequence by the suspension of another, like the tumbling of a row of blocks.

Such conditions were wanting in the panic of 1893. For three years business may be said to have been, in general, preparing for the storm. Prices of commodities declined; liquidation had already begun in the more speculative lines, and the affairs of the majority of merchants and mercantile houses were in better shape than at the beginning of the distress of twenty-five years before. The expression common last summer that it was a "rich man's panic" meant, if it meant anything, that it was the more fanciful and uncertain valuations which were at first and most disastrously affected. The news which reached us in November, 1890, that the old London house of Baring had been obliged to beg for money to meet its obligations because its funds were locked up in unsalable and speculative securities, was a notice served upon the financial world that a re-valuation of all enterprises and all business must be had. We should have had our panic following soon after that confession, had it not been for the bountiful crops in the following year, crops which were phenomenal both in yield and in prices because of crop failures in other parts of the world. Nature's bounty in 1891 was great enough to carry us through the succeeding year, so that it was not until May, 1893, that liquidation in the United States fairly began. No doubt the delay softened the blow to many, besides helping to change the character of our panic.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is the peculiarity of a new country to be speculative. Development means risk: great profit or great losses followed the establishment of new enterprises, especially in our younger States west of the Mississippi and Missouri rivers. Not only was this development, as we now know, pushed in advance of the real consumptive requirements, but, as we now see, the very activity of this development created an extra and large demand which ceased at the moment this activity itself stopped.

From 1880 to 1890 there were built in the United States approximately 75,000 miles of new railway. If we consider for a moment what this means, how many tons of steel and iron for rails and track construction, how much material and land for equipment and terminals, how much demand for food supply to laborers engaged in production, and, not least, how much revenue to the older railroads which carried the breadstuffs one way and the required iron and wood the other; and if we think that the same thing was going on as to mining and a thousand other pursuits, we are prepared to see how far our activity reacted upon itself, until at last the question of the ultimate market for all this output was forced upon us. It was the stoppage of this development which restricted trade so severely in the year just closed—the withdrawal from the iron furnace of the railway orders and from the manufacturer of the demand for supplies and machinery. Credit and our national optimism had hurried us on faster than the disposal of the national products had warranted, while the old and large profit made by the farmers in our great staple crops accelerated the pace.

The year 1894 would have seen more disasters had not the panic found us in better condition than in 1873. Our salvation from a worse fate lay in that fact of unconscious preparation. Business after the Baring liquidation could be, and was, gradually reduced to the curtailed demand; there were no entangling financial alliances to hinder such curtailment. Each firm or corporation met its own conditions, and with the exception of such business men as had spread out their sales or manufactures beyond their resources, the failures were not comparatively large. Wages were reduced either by direct cuts or by discharges, while in the latter case no doubt the incompetent suffered most. It is the belief of most of us that prosperity will come again to the United States; how long it will be delayed no one can tell. By this phrase we mean that the mineral, agricultural, and general resources of the country are such that development

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will begin again, slowly and cautiously at first, but gathering greater momentum as more markets open to the new or increasing products. Our advance has been so rapid that a steady business seems to us like a decline.

The year has taught us some healthful lessons. Continued success had made us as a nation believe that we could do anything without harm—that we were an exception to all economic law. No Asiatic or South American country could tamper with its currency without experiencing the ill effects, but the United States could get close to our silver precipice without danger of falling over; Spain, Italy, and Portugal could get into trouble with their national credit, but in the United States no apprehension need be felt because the foreign money-lender had fears regarding the intention of the Federal Government to pay in gold and on demand. Such small matters were beneath us: but we have had a rude awakening. Our people are beginning to see that good faith and prosperity, like liberty and union, are one and inseparable. Nor did we believe that any injustice to ourselves lay in juggling with the currency.

The greenback heresy of thirty years ago was the father of many of the wild proposals made in recent years. "Why should not the Government set its printing-presses going when it had debts to pay?" It needed a panic to force upon us the lesson that a government can no more manufacture money from nothing, than can an individual business man pay his obligations by assets of his own conjuring. Then, too, we shall probably never again see in the United States a high protective tariff. It *is* possible for a nation to interfere to a certain extent with the flow of trade without material harm: it *is* possible for so great a country as our own to increase in wealth for a time even though commerce should be artificially restricted. But manifestly such a policy has its limits. We have been trying to pull ourselves along by the straps of our own business boots, and the outcome in mechanics or economics is innocent as to the athletic side but barren of lasting results.

It is useless as it is unnecessary and indeed impossible to forecast the future. Trade regulates itself. What we need at the present is not speculation on the future of commerce, so much as determination to look our problems squarely in the face as they arise, and to maintain our credit at all hazards. The condition of the United States treasury two months ago was enough to make the patriotic American blush. We need reform of course—and the prospect now seems

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brighter—but we need also a set of Congressmen who would appreciate the argument that the credit of the United States, strong as it is, requires proper legislation before it becomes practically available. We should never forget that sentiment and fact are so intertwined in the fabric of public and mercantile credit as to make the drawing of a dividing line impossible. If we would have full confidence, both elements must be considered.

But no doubt these general problems will be put in a fair way to be eventually solved. Faith in the American people forbids any other conclusion. We may hold this opinion the more unhesitatingly because the history of the past year has taught us truths about public and private finance which were formerly passed over or ignored altogether. We may expect that trading and manufacturing, now having found or finding the new level, will go on with increasing volume. Inventions will play their important part. New uses for old things will be found. Cheap iron ore will permanently cheapen iron and its manufactured products. Structural steel, for illustration, already having shown a wonderful advance for the last decade, is no doubt destined to further triumphs, especially under late improvements of styles and processes of manufacture. There is no reason why large buildings alone should have the new steel frames, or why steel should not supersede wood in much of our future construction.

Even in trade the path to prosperity lies through improvement. The much-aspersed "department stores," for example, will at least teach retail grocers that they must put more brains into their business. There is no necessary connection between a corner grocery and bad taste or uncleanliness, though in too many instances an observer would be led to believe so.

As to our great agricultural interests we may think of their future with encouragement. We may believe that in some way the American farmers will "meet the market," and at a profit too; though the days are over when an immigrant could buy a farm on credit and pay for it in two or three years from his crops. Farming will be more like other businesses, requiring capital and training; but considered in this light it will be made profitable. If the present occupants cannot answer these conditions, they must give place to others who can. All improvements in farming of late years have been in the direction of better utilization of the horse, not in the line of a change of motive power except in threshing. The man who shall invent a new motor for the farmer—either through the application of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

electricity or in some other way—a motor which shall drive his plough and his mowing machine, run his farming operations generally, and get his produce to the nearest railroad market, will do much to solve our national trade problem. As to our railways, it is to be said that disasters have taught economies not before thought possible; though earnings are yet too low for safety.

An improvement here through permissive pooling would at once be felt among the three million of persons directly dependent upon transportation for food and clothing, and also among the manufacturers who look to the railways as the principal customers for their now seriously restricted product.

While, therefore, the depression of 1894, following the panic of 1893, has proved a bitter experience for the commercial interests of the United States, nothing but our own folly need lead us to distrust the future. The problems before us are not to be lightly regarded. They demand careful economic thought and good financial judgment. Nor need we expect at once a revival of the volume of trade and prosperity of former years. Above all we must as a people forever abandon the delusion that nature's generosity to us and our own supposed superiority have placed us above the financial and commercial laws which govern the rest of the civilized world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED